

No. 210); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

522. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Veterans' Administration for the fourth quarter of the 1945 fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3314. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; without amendment (Rept. No. 629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3356. A bill to provide for a 100-percent guaranty of loans to veterans to enable them to purchase farms; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3357. A bill to permit national banks to make loans guaranteed under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 without regard to certain limitations as to the value of the collateral and period of the loan; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 276. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the proceedings of the one hundred and fifty-fourth anniversary of the independence of Poland; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 277. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the proceedings in commemoration of Pan-American Day; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution making an appropriation for emergency flood-control work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2020, concerning blind aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the President of the Supreme Council of the Menocalist Union, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in regard to the death of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RYTER:

H. R. 3358. A bill to provide for the relief of Orlando Di Tomasso; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 3359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Belk; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3360. A bill for the relief of Mrs. W. H. (Agnes) Holmes; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

812. By Mr. GEELAN: Petition submitted by Roland H. Dainton, of Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn., containing the names of 115 residents of the State of Connecticut, city of New Haven, opposing House Joint Resolution 265 of the Connecticut State Legislature, calling for the passage of universal military training legislation at the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

813. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Clyde F. Winn, Waxahachie, Tex., favoring H. R. 2536; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

814. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Colonial Dames of America, New York, N. Y., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the preservation of constitutional Government at home, while our men are fighting tyranny abroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

815. Also, petition of Ketchum-Hennessey Post, No. 1515, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Coney Island, N. Y., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the transfer of House veterans' affairs to some other House committee than that now conducting them; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art our refuge and strength, we commit our Nation and ourselves to Thee.

Turning from quiet, grassy acres where sleep our warrior dead, inspired and challenged by the sacrifice of remembered yesterdays, we dedicate afresh all that we have and are to the unfinished tasks before us. We are grateful that around the ugliness and unhappiness of the present we have walked amidst great memories and glorious hopes.

So fashion our desires and deeds in accordance with Thy will that, rising to the full measure of our duty and our opportunity, we may yet build the new world, for which good men have bravely died, wherein the nations may live together in trust and fellowship. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 28, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 28, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 72. An act for the relief of Antonio Ruiz;
S. 93. An act for the relief of Mary G. Marggraf;

S. 194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston;

S. 498. An act for the relief of W. C. Wornhoff and Josephine Wornhoff;

S. 519. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka;

S. 567. An act for the relief of Mrs. Freda Gullikson;

S. 645. An act to suspend until 6 months after the termination of the present wars section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended; and

S. 647. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the naval advance base depot at North Kingstown, R. I.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 29, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 72. An act for the relief of Antonio Ruiz;
S. 93. An act for the relief of Mary G. Marggraf;

S. 194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston;

S. 498. An act for the relief of W. C. Wornhoff and Josephine Wornhoff;

S. 519. An act for the relief of Charles A. Straka;

S. 567. An act for the relief of Mrs. Freda Gullikson;

S. 645. An act to suspend until 6 months after the termination of the present wars section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended; and

S. 347. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the naval advance base depot at North Kingstown, R. I.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 502) to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 908. An act for the relief of Myles Perz; and

H. R. 2007. An act for the relief of Hattie Bowers.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 905) for the relief of Paul T. Thompson; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3306. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 383. An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work;

S. 938. An act to provide for emergency flood control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes;

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of the estate of Myles Perz;

H. R. 1947. An act to authorize an increase in the payment of the chaplain at the United States Military Academy while serving under reappointment for an additional term or terms; and

H. R. 2007. An act for the relief of Hattie Bowers.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. WAGNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin asked to be recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I did tell the Chair, if he could see me this morning, that I would appreciate recognition, but I did not realize at the time that there was an adjournment from the last session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today is a new legislative day, and therefore the usual course will be followed.

The Senator from Arizona was first on his feet, and is now recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wanted to move at the proper time that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will wait until after the morning hour, that will be in order.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 28th instant,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; and for other purposes, reported it on May 23, 1945, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 316) thereon.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT—AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Under authority of the order of the 28th instant,

The following notices in writing were submitted on May 29, 1945:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1946, and for other purposes, and to submit the following amendments, namely: Page 3, after line 2, insert the following item:

"DIVISION OF GEOGRAPHY

"Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Division of Geography in performing the duties imposed upon the Secretary by Executive Order 6680 dated April 17, 1934, relating to uniform usage in regard to geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government, including personal services in the District of Columbia, stationery and office supplies, and printing and binding, \$70,000."

Page 10, line 17, before the period, under the heading "Grazing Service, salaries and expenses", insert: "Provided, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Grazing Service, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed, to the appropriation for 'Salaries and expenses, Grazing Service,' current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured, from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment."

Page 43, line 2, after the figures "1947", in the paragraph "Natives in Alaska", insert: "and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for Indian school purposes, without compensation therefor, so much of the land, structures, facilities, stores, supplies, and equipment of every character located at Fort Raymond, Seward, Alaska, as may be mutually agreed upon and approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

Page 55, after line 25, following the last paragraph under the caption "Bureau of Indian Affairs", insert:

"All sums herein and hereafter appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including tribal funds, for acquisition of lands; construction, repair, and rehabilitation of irrigation systems on Indian reservations; construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of Indian Reservation roads; and construction, repair, or rehabilitation of school, agency, hospital, or other buildings and utilities, including the purchase of furniture, furnishings, and equipment therefor, shall remain available for two fiscal years following the fiscal year for which made."

Page 57, line 17, after the words "United States", in the paragraph "Administrative provisions" under the Bureau of Reclamation, insert: "Provided further, That all sums herein and hereafter appropriated for the Bureau of Reclamation for construction, or for continuation of construction of projects, for general investigations, for investigations of projects, for investigation and construction of projects or for activities necessary or proper in the development and settlement of irrigated lands shall be immediately available and shall be available for two fiscal years following the fiscal year for which made."

Page 96, line 5, after the word "measures", in the paragraph "Forest protection and fire prevention", insert: "Including necessary local transportation and subsistence in kind of persons selected for employment or as cooperators, serving without other compensation while attending fire-protection training camps in connection with the fire-control programs of the National Park Service."

Page 116, after line 25, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Sec. 10. Hereafter the Secretary may delegate to subordinates the power to authorize changes in official stations of officers and em-

ployees and the payment of expenses of travel and transportation of household goods in connection with such change of official stations."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted sundry amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3024, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 79, line 23, after the word "shared", in the paragraph "Synthetic liquid fuels", insert: "Provided further, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of \$15,000,000 during the period covered by the aforesaid act, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and appropriations hereafter made for the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligations so created."

Mr. O'MAHONEY also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3024, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 111, line 22, after the word "Governor", in the first paragraph under the caption "Government in the Virgin Islands", insert "Provided, That the Executive Assistant to the Governor shall be appointed by and with the approval of the Governor."

Mr. CHAVEZ also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3024, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

CONDOLENCE ON DEATH OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, expressing condolence on the death of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt, which, with the accompanying resolution, was ordered to lie on the table.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE CONGRESS
OF CUBA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution adopted by the Congress of the Republic of Cuba, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The house of representatives and the senate, in sessions assembled on the 23d and 24th day of April of the current year, respectively, have approved the following joint resolution:

First. To join in the universal mourning caused by the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, author and defender of the "four freedoms," champion of the good-neighbor policy among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere and great friend of Cuba.

Second. To express to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and through them to the Nation which bears most directly the great and irreparable loss of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, their wholehearted sympathy.

Third. To meet on the 30th of January of next year, the anniversary of the birth of Franklin D. Roosevelt, in solemn session of the legislative power, as a tribute to the people of Cuba to the memory of the creator of the good neighbor policy among the nations of the Western Hemisphere, greatest promoter of American unity and leader of the democracies. The presidents of both legislative bodies will designate with rightful precedence a senator and a representative to speak in this session.

Fourth. To address all legislative bodies of the continent, requesting that they join in a similar meeting of tribute so that all our countries with the excellent unanimity of a feeling of justice, may render, on the same day and with commensurate respect, a great tribute to the builder of the new America, renowned herald of freedom for all people and of human well-being.

Fifth. To initiate the adoption of a measure which provides for:

(a) The organization, on the 30th of next January of a student parade in each town district in the Republic, which will symbolize the recognition by the men of the future of one of the champions of human freedom and the leader of the world of tomorrow, with the children of public and private schools assisting and wearing a picture of Roosevelt on the breast.

(b) A grant of \$25,000 which will be placed at the disposition of the Pan American Union, as a contribution from Cuba to a continental monument that the American nations wish to erect to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the form and place to be determined by the directive council of the Union; and

(c) The invitation to all the parliaments of America through the minister of state of the Republic to join in these resolutions, a plan which the personality and greatness of Roosevelt demands, adopting them in each town.

Sixth. To affix the text, translated into Spanish, of the "four freedoms" created and defended by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a suitable place in the capitol building, a transcription which will be done in bronze letters, to perpetually call them to mind in the present and future generations, and as a lasting memorial to the eminent statesman who conceived them, spoke them, and gave them universal meaning:

"In the future days, whose security we seek, we look forward to a world based on four essential freedoms:

"The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

"The second is the freedom of every individual to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

"The third is the freedom from want, freedom which in world terms means the economic understandings which will assure in each nation, a healthy and peaceful life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

"The fourth is the freedom from fear, which, in the world terms, means the reduction of armaments to such a degree and in such a manner that no nation can commit an act of physical aggression against another—anywhere in the world."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CLARENCE J. SPIKER AND FRED W. JANDREY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Clarence J. Spiker and Fred W. Jandrey (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC DOMAIN LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation declaring certain lands to be a part of the public domain and providing for the administration thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX, AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth report of action taken under Section 217 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.), relating to the coordination of forwarding and similar servicing of waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF
DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth annual report of the administration for the period July 1, 1943, through June 30, 1944, covering the operations of the Federal Home Loan Banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Associations, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the United States Housing Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Executive Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a request for an increase in the estimate of personnel requirements for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of personnel requirements for the Administration

for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

WITHDRAWAL OF NAME FROM REPORT ON
DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing a name from a report heretofore transmitted to the Senate by him of certain aliens whose deportation he suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on Immigration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 65

"Whereas the existence and continuation of the cotton industry of Texas and the Nation is being threatened by the invasion of the most serious and costly of all cotton pests, the pink bollworm; and

"Whereas all known methods of control, including insecticides and cultural procedures, have failed to stop the advance of this pest in its unabated stampede through south and west Texas, paralleling similar invasion of the boll weevil during the latter part of the preceding century; and

"Whereas the only known successful method of stopping the advance of this pest into the uninfested parts of the Cotton Belt in the United States and of eradicating it in the infested areas, is by starving it out by the establishment of a noncotton zone in the infested area, for at least one full crop season; and

"Whereas if the pink bollworm is permitted to establish itself definitely in the Cotton Belt, the cost of producing cotton will be increased by not less than 20 percent and the quality of both cotton and seed produced thereafter will be of inferior quality and grade; and

"Whereas the present condition of the cotton industry of Texas and the United States is not in a position to permit this increase in the cost of production and lowering the quality of the product produced; and

"Whereas the opportunity of eradication may never come again to the posterity of our Nation because once the pest is spread throughout the Cotton Belt its eradication will be impossible, thus resulting in an irreparable damage and loss to the wealth of our Nation; and

"Whereas the eradication of this pest is not only possible at this stage of the invasion but the economics of our accomplishing it at this time with a minimum of interference with our over-all agricultural needs is very apparent; and

"Whereas at the present time there is an overabundance of cotton, there being approximately 11,000,000 bales under Government loan in storage; and

"Whereas there is a great scarcity of food throughout the world; and

"Whereas it behooves the non-cotton-growing areas of the United States to assist the South to remain in the cotton business to avoid unnecessary duplication of crops, and their interest and cooperation in this project is logically to be expected; and

"Whereas the details of governmental assistance in the contemplated non-cotton-zone area, if created in adjusting itself to the much-needed food crops, can be worked out without sacrifice or loss to the agriculture of this section by proper preparation for such crop transition, if necessary; and

"Whereas in order to properly eradicate this infestation, it will be necessary to have the cooperation of the Republic of Mexico, from which the pink bollworm has migrated and spread to the State of Texas; and

"Whereas our sister Republic of Mexico is also interested in stamping out this infestation, and is now engaged in a program of eradication and control thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States be memorialized to investigate the advisability of creating an International Pink Bollworm Commission with the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of eradicating and combating the spread of the pink bollworm infestation in both countries; and be it further

"Resolved, That in the event such a Commission is created and noncotton zones are established in both the United States and the Republic of Mexico, that proper provision be made by our Government for compensation to the cotton growers affected and the related interests in such noncotton zones as may be established in the United States, in order to alleviate as nearly as possible the monetary losses and damages resulting therefrom; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives forward a certified copy hereof to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to each of the United States Senators from Texas, and to each Representative from Texas in the National House of Representatives, with the respectful request that it be presented forthwith to each branch of our Congress for appropriate consideration and action."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 32

"Whereas the Illinois and Michigan Canal Commission has presented to the Members of Congress from Illinois a bill designed to grant all right, title, and interest of the United States in the canal and its abutting property to the State of Illinois, and it is desirable that this legislation be enacted: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we respectfully request the Members of Congress to support said bill and exert their efforts to procure its enactment; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America."

Two resolutions of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution No. 227

"Resolution relative to memorializing Congress to take action to extend the 1945 shooting season for migratory wildlife in California and to continue to divide such season between the northern and southern sections of the State

"Whereas in 1944 the shooting season for migratory wildlife in California was extended by 10 days, such extension being of great benefit and aid in harvesting the game crop and in curtailing destruction of farm crops; and

"Whereas the 1944 shooting season was also divided relative to the northern and southern sections of the State, thereby enabling sportsmen in each section to enjoy equal advantages and corresponding results; and

"Whereas the benefits thus derived merit the continuance and further extension of such season in 1945: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Congress is hereby respectfully memorialized to take such action as may

be necessary to further extend, by 10 or 15 days, the 1945 shooting season for migratory wildlife in California and to continue in effect the divided season as between the northern and southern sections of the State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Chief of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior of the United States, Merchandise Mart, Chicago 54, Ill."

"House Resolution No. 228

"Resolution relative to memorializing the President and Congress to make available sufficient ammunition for the control of predators and the harvesting of game crops

"Whereas during the progress of the war the manufacture and sale of shotgun and rifle shells for use by the public has been largely curtailed and retarded; and

"Whereas there is a great need for such shells to control predators and also for the use of sportsmen to harvest the crops of game which have accumulated during the war; and

"Whereas the harvesting of game crops would substantially relieve the meat shortage which now prevails throughout the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the President and Congress are respectfully memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to make available to the public an adequate amount of shotgun and rifle shells for the control of predators and the harvesting of game crops; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Chairman of the War Production Board."

A petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying that the investigation of the Naval Board of Inquiry with regard to the Pearl Harbor disaster be made public and to punish those found guilty of negligence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A statement from the Aviation League of the United States, Washington, D. C., relating to food shortage; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Colonial Dames of America, New York City, N. Y., relating to the preservation of constitutional government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from several citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., praying the good offices of the American Government in the establishment of free and independent governments in Syria and Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Two telegrams in the nature of memorials from Drs. H. L. Cobean and W. H. Neel, both of Wellington, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the section relating to medical care in the so-called Wagner-Dingell bill; to the Committee on Finance.

CERTAIN ACTIONS OF PROTEST AGAINST PORTUGUESE DICTATOR SALAZAR

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record and appropriately referred copy of a resolution

recently adopted at a meeting of American citizens of Portuguese origin, at New Bedford, Mass., protesting against the recent action of the Portuguese Dictator Salazar who, they allege, has cast Nazi reflections upon the 250,000 Portuguese Americans of New England.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas we, American citizens of Portuguese ancestry and delegates of societies representing many more thousands of the 250,000 American citizens of Portuguese origin residing in New England, freely assembling this 20th day of May, 1945, at the auditorium, in the city of New Bedford, Mass., on the call of the Portuguese American Council for Democracy, do unanimously denounce and condemn the acts and actions of the Portuguese Fascist dictator, Antonio Oliveira Salazar, which malign all peoples of Portuguese origin:

First. We unanimously condemn the Portuguese dictator's recent decree establishing 2 days of national mourning in Portugal for the dead arch criminal leader of the Nazi gangsters, Adolf Hitler;

Second. We unanimously denounce the official attendance by the Salazar government at the Nazi Fascist rites held in the city of Lisbon to honor the memory of Hitler;

Third. We unanimously denounce the solidarity manifested by the Salazar government over the past years with Nazi-Fascist gangsterism and the enemies of the United States of America, including the reciprocal assistance pact between the Salazar regime and its Fascist neighbor, the Spain of Francisco Franco, seeking to perpetuate Nazi fascism in westernmost Europe and the Atlantic islands; as well as the Fascist use of propaganda by Salazar through his controlled press, close relationships and common language, in an endeavor to carry fascism to our sister republic, the United States of Brazil;

Fourth. We unanimously denounce the savage use of force—including concentration camps and torture—by the Salazar Fascists against the peaceful people of Portugal who previously had a long and unbroken record of democratic institutions and friendly relations with the United States of America, and the vicious repression of free and representative government in Portugal;

Fifth. We unanimously condemn the state-controlled Fascist economy which has raised barriers to the natural commerce and interchange of goods between the United States of America and the Portuguese people, except as the Salazar regime has been forced to accept some American products when not available from any other source;

Sixth. We unanimously denounce the attendance at the San Francisco Conference as an observer for the Salazar government of Dutra Faria, henchman of Salazar and notorious for his vicious campaigns and attacks upon our democratic system of government, as recorded in the columns of Salazar's official Fascist newspaper, "Diario da Manhã";

Seventh. We unanimously denounce all these and similar Fascist practices of the Salazar totalitarian regime as violating the natural instincts and desires of the people of Portugal, as destroying the humane principles of civilization and democracy and the dignity of man, as an insult to the 35,000 American servicemen of Portuguese origin and the patriotic members of the Brazilian Expeditionary Forces, and as a ghastly mockery of the memory of those who have sacrificed their lives to destroy the very fascism which Salazar so abasely represents; and

Whereas by reason of these acts committed by the Salazar regime, it has forfeited its right to continue friendly diplomatic relations with the government of the United States of America; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution and the foregoing preambles be transmitted to the Honorable Leverett W. Saltonstall and the Honorable David I. Walsh, United States Senators from Massachusetts, the Honorable John W. McCormack, and the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Representatives from the 12th and 14th Congressional Districts of Massachusetts, in whose statesmanship and foresight we place the highest trust, and that they be, and hereby are, petitioned to introduce in the Congress appropriate measures to effect the severance of diplomatic relations between the Government of the United States of America and the Salazar regime, and further petitioned to request the Department of State and the Department of Justice or other appropriate agencies forthwith to cancel the visa heretofore issued to said Dutra Faria to the end that he may be forthwith expelled from American soil; and further.

Resolved, That the chairman of this meeting, J. P. Curry, be, and he hereby is, duly authorized and empowered to take any and all such other action as he may deem necessary, desirable, or appropriate in order to cause dissemination of these resolutions and preambles and in order to effect and carry out their purpose, and to report thereon from time to time.

LIFTING OF BAN ON HORSE RACING

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the Record a letter from J. Lee Lewis, Omaha, Nebr., embodying a resolution adopted at the May meeting of the Omaha (Nebr.) Ministerial Union, relating to lifting the ban on horse racing.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE OMAHA MINISTERIAL UNION,
Omaha, Nebr., May 23, 1945.

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to state that at the May meeting of the Omaha Ministerial Union the following resolution, representing 160 clergymen, was passed:

"That we record our objection to the recent lifting of the ban on national horse racing, with its wasteful use of gasoline, tires, cars, and other forms of transportation, when the ODT forces the church bodies to cancel their annual national conventions or greatly reduce them this year.

"2. That we send a strong protest to all of our Nebraska Senators and congressional Representatives in the Nation's Capital."

Questions raised and unanswered were: If there is enough gas available for race addicts, and if other said-to-be-needed war materials are now available, why are church organizational conventions, camps, assemblies "verboden"? Churches build civilian morale in these days of sorrow. Our church camps for boys and girls prevent juvenile delinquents. Racing seems sacrilegious and unnecessary now.

Why are the churches subject to this unjust discrimination?

I have the honor to remain,
Yours very truly,

J. LEE LEWIS,
Secretary.

LIFTING OF THE BAN ON SPORTS AND TRAVEL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the people of this country have shown they wish to do their utmost in cooperation with any program to help win the war. The gasoline rationing program has been no

exception. However, the recent action of the War Committee on Conventions of the Office of Defense Transportation in lifting the ban on horse and dog races but retaining the restrictions on religious conventions has given rise to much questioning of the justice and equity of the policy.

As indicative of some of the thinking on this question, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Sports? Yes! Religion? Limited!" The editorial is from the May 23, 1945, issue of the Christian-Evangelist, edited by Dr. Raphael Harwood Miller, formerly pastor of the National City Christian Church of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPORTS? YES! RELIGION? LIMITED!

The beer trucks "go rolling along." Curfew is off on taverns and night clubs. The brown-out is lifted. The race tracks are wide open to the old business of gambling and as much travel as the patrons can get by with. The "ponies" and their equipment will travel from place to place. There is to be no restriction on vacation travel.

But the Office of Defense Transportation and the Committee on Conventions have cracked down on the summer activities of religious education agencies.

Directives issued by ODT are as dogmatic as papal bulls, but the interpretation of many of them requires the clairvoyant powers of a Daniel.

Everyone approves the first claim of the armed services upon transportation facilities. Church bodies cordially have cooperated with the War Committee on Conventions by canceling their national and area conventions.

Secretaries of church boards of education and directors of youth camps recognize the gigantic task faced by the ODT. If the present directive on summer assemblies were nondiscriminatory, no protest would arise. But the Committee on Conventions has ruled that camps and assemblies are beyond its scope only if they follow "the normal vacation camping pattern, combining recreation and instruction, but with recreation, swimming, boating, fishing, hiking, woodcraft, and the like, predominating and with only incidental instruction in noncamping subjects."

No limitation is placed on commercial camps, but religious camps are definitely restricted. Thus, Government dictates to the church the limitation of its religious program.

The privileged and financially able can have their vacations and sports though these involve travel and hotel accommodations. But thousands of young people are denied who would profit by summer church camps and instruction meetings made available to them by their churches.

There is something offensive in the concession that meetings and camps primarily for recreation may be held by church groups as well as by others and that worship and religious instruction may be introduced afterward, but the meeting must be advertised for vacation purposes. That is, religion may be slipped in as a secondary interest.

Sports? Yes. Religion? No.

This is an invitation to call religious camp and summer-school meetings under pretense that they are primarily for recreation rather than for Christian leadership training. We wonder what influences in Washington bring about this condition.

Has the Committee on Conventions been informed of the revelations made by J. Edgar Hoover of the extent of juvenile delinquency in this country and its effects upon the home

and society? Does the Committee have the statistics of increasing crime among the teenage youth of America?

Horse racing, commercial camps, vacation resorts may advertise their attractions. But religious camps may not appeal to the youth of America with opportunities for increasing their efficiency as Christian leaders in the church and in the Nation.

Each year thousands of young people elect to spend their vacation time in summer camps under local and national councils of religious education.

"It has been true for years with many denominations that one-half of all the standard teacher-training credits for church and church school leaders have been earned in their summer camps and assemblies. They are an essential phase of the church's educational program."

Secretaries of boards of religious education and executives of the International Council now have before them the alternatives to cancel all summer religious assemblies; to go ahead with camps and assemblies on the assumption Government will not interfere or to make recreation instead of religious training the major appeal to young people of the churches.

The leaders in religious education have tried by every means to get an adjustment of the ruling of the War Committee on Conventions to permit summer assemblies for young people in church-owned and church-supervised camps. They have had little success.

It is time to have an understanding with Government as to the meaning of this discrimination against the church's educational program as against "no restrictions" on vacation travel, commercial camps, and sports. Are we going the way of Hitler's "joy through strength" youth organization and Mussolini's young "black shirts"?

Are sports more important to America's future than religious and moral training?

It is time to speak out.

TARIFF ON CUBAN SUGAR

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record and appropriately referred, a letter I have received from the Beet Sugar Refineries Employees Union No. 23136, of Garden City, Kans., expressing their opposition to any reduction in the tariff on Cuban sugar.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GARDEN CITY, KANS., May 22, 1945.

DEAR SIR: Beet Sugar Refinery Employees Union No. 23136 enters a strong protest to the passage of the above bill authorizing further reduction of 50 percent in sugar tariff. In the past 11 years we find the tariff on Cuban sugar has been reduced from \$2 per hundred pounds to 75 cents per hundred pounds. We feel that further reduction in the sugar tariff would cause undue hardship on the beet-sugar industry and its employees. The standard of living and wages that has been built up by the unions and the employees of these industries as compared to foreign standards, must necessarily have some protection.

We feel that you as a citizen of a sugar-producing State will give your wholehearted support to this cause.

Thanking you in advance, we remain,
Respectfully yours,
BEET SUGAR REFINERY EMPLOYEES
UNION No. 23136,
O. G. HAGLER,

Recording Secretary.

SCARCITY OF FRESH MEAT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred a letter I have just received from Mr. Lee Circle, president of the Kansas Food Dealers' Association. Mr. Circle operates food stores in Arkansas City, Kan., and knows whereof he writes when he states there has not been any fresh meat in Arkansas City for 5 days. He points out that he, as a food dealer, cannot buy chickens for his customers, because consumers drive out to the farms and pay retail price ceilings.

This food dealer says he does not blame the consumers and he does not blame the farmers. He does not write so charitably about the Office of Price Administration, and he has my full sympathy.

Of course, the OPA policy of allowing wages and other production costs to rise, while holding retail prices at what amounts to prewar levels, cannot work effectively unless somewhere along the line some producer, processor, or handler operates at a loss or goes out of business. Sometimes I think the experts in OPA want the middleman to go out of business, and at other times I wonder if they would prefer that he do business at a loss. If it is any comfort to the economists in OPA, some of the middlemen have gone through both stages.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 31, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

ARKANSAS CITY, KANS., May 25, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: There hasn't been any fresh meat in our city for 5 days. We cannot buy chickens from the farmer because the public drives out to the farm and pays the retail ceiling. We can't even raise the price to help pay for the customers' gasoline if we bought the chickens at the farmers' asked price. Understand I don't blame the farmer; he is entitled to every cent he can get. But the OPA and WFA can be blamed.

One poultry house stopped selling me chickens because I weighed them on him and found him 15 to 16 percent short. I understand some slaughterers are weighing meat the same way.

Senator, if you could come back to Kansas and visit a few grocery stores you would find we are back to old bologna days; that's all we get. It's full of cereal and other tripe.

As president of the Kansas Food Dealers Association I appeal to you to go to work on the OPA; it's sick and needs an operation; please do help to amend the present OPA law. It might be better to get a responsible man for food administrator; get some practical man who knows food.

Yours very truly,

LEE CIRCLE,
President, Kansas Food Dealers Association.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

name of persons employed by the committee, who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of May, in compliance with the terms of Sen-

S. 1045. A bill to provide for pay and allowances and transportation and subsistence of personnel discharged or released from the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard because of under age at the time of enlistment, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 318).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1024. A bill to further extend the effectiveness of the act approved December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 319).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in Springerville, Ariz., of a memorial to Gustav Becker; with amendments (Rept. No. 320).

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of May 1945, of a chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired)...	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	\$6,000
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (A. A.), U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J.	do.	1,152

DAVID I. WALSH, Chairman.

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

MAY 31, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of May, in compliance with the terms of Sen-

ate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	317 Lynn Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	\$2,400
Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2745 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,400
Yeoman (2c) Eleanor W. St. Clair, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2134 R St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	1,152
Yeoman (2c) Loretto F. Jochman, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do.	do.	1,152

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH.

LAKE CHAMPLAIN BRIDGES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake

Champlain Bridge Commission and I submit a report (No. 317) thereon.

The joint resolution relates to refunding operations in the case of two bridges across Lake Champlain which are under the charge of the Lake Champlain Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 113,

which is identical to Senate Joint Resolution 62, be taken up at this time, it already having been passed by the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Connecticut will be received, and the House joint resolution will be read by title.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 62 will be indefinitely postponed.

INVESTIGATION OF DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND RELATED PROBLEMS (REPT. NO. 321)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs I report an original resolution, which I ask to have referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

I have prepared a written report to accompany the resolution, which is now in the hands of the stenographer, and I ask unanimous consent that the report, without the appendixes attached thereto, may be printed at length in the RECORD and that I may file it after the Senate shall have recessed this evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 129), reported by Mr. O'MAHONEY from the Committee on Military Affairs, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to continue the study and investigation with respect to war contracts, the termination of war contracts, and related problems authorized by Senate Resolution 198, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, as heretofore supplemented and extended, to be conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, and is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the disposal of surplus Government property and related problems. The committee shall report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its studies and investigations under this resolution, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The powers and duties conferred or imposed by Senate Resolution 198, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, with respect to the study and investigation under that resolution shall also be applicable with respect to the studies and investigations under this resolution. The subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs heretofore authorized to make the study and investigation under Senate Resolution 198, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, shall be deemed to have been continued as a subcommittee duly authorized to make the studies and investigations under this resolution, until the Committee on Military Affairs shall otherwise direct.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Sev-

enty-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee.

The report (No. 321) submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY from the Committee on Military Affairs was ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the appendixes attached thereto, as follows:

TO INVESTIGATE THE DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY, AND RELATED PROBLEMS

For the purpose of authorizing the continuation of the study it has been carrying on through the Subcommittee on War Contracts of the problems arising from the termination of war contracts and the disposal of surplus property, the Military Affairs Committee recommends that a special allotment of \$25,000 be made from the contingent fund of the Senate and to that end recommends the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to continue the study and investigation with respect to war contracts, the termination of war contracts, and related problems authorized by Senate Resolution 198, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, as heretofore supplemented and extended, to be conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, and is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the disposal of surplus Government property and related problems. The committee shall report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its studies and investigations under this resolution, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The powers and duties conferred or imposed by Senate Resolution 198, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, with respect to the study and investigation under that resolution shall be applicable with respect to the studies and investigations under this resolution. The subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs heretofore authorized to make the study and investigation under Senate Resolution 198, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, shall be deemed to have been continued as a subcommittee duly authorized to make the studies and investigations under this resolution, until the Committee on Military Affairs shall otherwise direct.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee."

PREPARATION OF RECONVERSION LAWS

The Military Affairs Committee during the Seventy-eighth Congress worked on the drafting of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Public Law 457, 78th Cong.) and the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (Public Law 395, 78th Cong.) and also cooperated with the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning in the preparation of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (Public Law 458, 78th Cong.). Preliminary work with respect to these laws was done by the Subcommittee on War Contracts which was specially authorized to conduct studies on these and related subjects by Senate Resolution 198 and Senate Resolution 288 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. Its funds were extended to June 30, 1945, by Senate Resolution 48, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session. The Committee on Military Affairs is of the opinion that the continuation of the study is imperative. It was recognized when the three laws above mentioned were enacted that reconversion following this war would be a task of unprecedented magnitude. The three statutes were introduced and enacted because Congress was convinced that preparations for the transition from war to peace should be undertaken well in advance of the end of hostilities. It was deemed more important to enact the statutes and set up the administrative mechanisms to reconvert than by prolonged study to delay the creation of the reconversion bureaus. It was felt that Congress by observation and the bureaus by experience would be in position to recommend any changes or any additional legislation that might be desirable.

Of the three laws enacted to facilitate reconversion, the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 has apparently been working with great efficiency and without complaint. The total value of all contracts terminated as of March 31, 1945, was \$27,500,000,000 of which \$19,600,000,000 was in fixed cost contracts and \$7,900,000,000 in cost plus a fixed fee contracts. Of the total number of contracts terminated as of March 31, 1945, the value of those for which settlement has already been made is \$18,000,000,000.

Every effort has been made not only to settle the contracts, but to clear the plants and to put all contractors, prime and sub both, so far as possible, in a financial position to proceed with civilian work whenever it becomes available.

Greater difficulties have confronted the Surplus Property Board than those with which the Office of Contract Settlement has had to deal. In the first place, although the surplus property law was approved on October 3, 1944, the Board was not fully appointed until several months later and other delays were encountered in the selection of a staff and in the allocation of appropriations. Furthermore, it is still impossible to estimate what the total quantity of surplus property will eventually be. Plans have not developed rapidly and only a comparatively few special orders and general regulations have been issued. The Board has not been a unit with respect to policy on all of the regulations which have been announced.

FIFTEEN MILLION JOBS NEEDED

The Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has been primarily concerned to date with problems affecting the successful prosecution of the war. Although the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion 2 days after VE-day announced a partial program of readjustment and although the War Production Board has since made public the steps it is taking to release controls which are no longer deemed necessary, it still remains true that the early termination of the war against Japan would actually find the national economy unprepared for the resumption of civilian production on a scale that would begin to supply sufficient opportunities for employment to keep the economic system working smoothly.

No one in or out of the Government can predict with the slightest certainty how jobs can be provided after the collapse of Japan for the fifteen to eighteen million workers now engaged in the production of war materials who, after that day, will have to be transferred to the production of goods for civilian use if we are to have anything approximating full employment.

Of the 9,000,000 persons now in war work, there is visible civilian work for only 3,000,000 persons in the same plants. There are, therefore, according to the War Manpower Commission, 6,000,000 persons for whom employment must be found by reconversion. Add to these the proportion of those now in the military forces who will not be retained for postwar military purposes and we have probably 10,000,000 more, so that after allowances are made for the natural increase of the population and even for the withdrawal of many workers from the labor market, all statistical observers seem to agree that the number of persons for whom jobs must be found in the reconverted economy will number not less than 15,000,000 and may be as many as 18,000,000.

The present level of employment is maintained by Government purchases. Uncle Sam is the principal customer for all producers. If he withdraws from the market the civilian purchasing power must be maintained if civilian production is to be maintained. There are already straws in the wind indicating a decline of purchasing power. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics this week reported that the income of farmers for May 1945 was approximately 4 percent below their income in May 1944. Figures obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that the income of industrial workers is now probably 4 to 5 percent below what it was a year ago. The reduction of the income of both farmers and industrial workers is a warning of the dangers that may arise if reconversion is not accomplished efficiently and speedily.

Cut-backs of war orders are rapidly mounting. The War Production Board has estimated that production for war purposes will have declined 12 percent in the first quarter after European victory, 20 percent in the second, 27 percent in the third, and 35 percent in the fourth, but the War Manpower Commission sees the cut-backs proceeding at a more rapid rate, approximating a reduction of 35 percent in the third quarter and 50 percent in the fourth quarter. Both of these estimates are based upon a one-front war and it is upon a schedule of production for war purposes approximating not to exceed 50 percent below the amount we were turning out before victory in Europe that all plans for reconversion have been based. But if the Japanese war should suddenly cease and the reduction of war production should rise to 100 percent below the rate while the war with Germany was still being waged, the problem of employment would be of the gravest possible character.

What may happen in the future by way of cut-backs is indicated by what has already happened and is happening. The Maritime Commission has suspended the expansion of the cargo fleet. The Navy program is fixed. The production of steel plate at the Geneva steel plant, for example, will have ceased before August 1945 on the basis of present orders, and unless some method is found to convert this plant for production of civilian goods, it may be expected that long before the end of the year it, like the aircraft plant at Willow Run, will be completely idle. The Defense Plant Corporation has employed a private engineering firm to make a survey of the possible uses of the Geneva plant, but this report is not expected to be ready before October. The Surplus Property Board has its own staff at work, but the present prospect is that the curtailment of war orders will outrun all plans, both private and public, for the substitution

of an active civilian economy for the disappearing war economy.

The sudden end of the Japanese war, a happy event which is not at all outside the contemplation of military leaders, would precipitate the country into the postwar world without anything resembling adequate preparation. This is the circumstance which makes it imperative that the Congressional study of the problem shall continue.

WHAT WE HAVE SHIPPED ABROAD

Too little attention is being given to the fact that the present high rate of employment and the unprecedented size of our national income is all dependent upon the purchase by the Government out of the national debt and tax revenues of the stupendous war output of the American industrial machine. Through lend-lease we have equipped the United Nations, but when the war is over that market will come to an end just as it has now come to an end with respect to the war in Europe and unless we have something to substitute for war purchases the country is likely to be face to face with another great crisis.

The tremendous volume of the materials we have shipped abroad for the purposes of the war is so great as to be almost beyond the grasp of imagination. We talk about it in general terms and general terms do not convey the picture.

A specific illustration is more dramatic and eloquent. In order to carry on the war, this country has already shipped to France 1,922 railroad locomotives of all types. As of December 31, 1944, the Union Pacific Railroad, for all its far-flung operations in the United States, owned only 1,589 locomotives. Even the Santa Fe Railroad, which serves a greater area of the United States than the Union Pacific, has fewer locomotives (1,745) than we have shipped across the seas to provide transportation for our armies and the armies of our Allies in France. This does not take into consideration the railroad equipment we sent to North Africa nor the equipment, both motive power and rolling stock, which we sent into Persia to rehabilitate the railroad over which our lend-lease supplies were poured into Russia.

All this is coming to an end. We are planning to leave an army of 400,000 men in Europe for purposes of occupation. The movement of 3,100,000 men out of Europe has already begun, and while much material and equipment will be needed to handle this movement and to maintain the army of occupation, it is obvious that new production will not be required.

We know that the railroad system of the United States is now operating on its last reserves of equipment. American railroads have been starved in order to provide military transportation abroad. The reequipment of American railroads will provide employment for many—provided, when we stop producing for war, we shall be ready to move speedily into the production for peace. Railroads along the lines of which war factories are closing and reconversion is not proceeding might easily be hesitant about authorizing expenditures for the full rehabilitation they so sadly need.

CONGRESSIONAL POSTWAR POLICY

Reconversion is a task to be accomplished in terms of all industries. Just as it was necessary to prepare for war by gearing all of our industrial, material, and manpower resources into one united effort, so it will be necessary for peace to provide similar coordination. The task is even greater than that of mobilizing for war, because in the latter effort all thoughts were centered upon one objective, and whatever means seemed likely to produce the desired result were adopted, regardless of the effect upon local economic structure. In organizing our conversion for war we were stimulated by a great patriotic impulse to win the war speedily.

In conversion for peace that impulse will be lacking, and it is all the more important, therefore, that Congress should not relax its vigilance in observing and planning for the mobilization for peace.

The industrial concentration which existed before the war was accentuated by the war despite every effort to provide opportunities for little business. One hundred prime contractors at the top handled approximately 70 percent of all war contracts and although there were many thousands of subcontractors, they were a part of a centralized system. Now the task will be to provide opportunities for commerce and industry in such a manner as to permit the reconstruction of our State and local economy. To this end all thoughts will have to be directed in the formulation of the program for the disposal of surplus property.

When Congress passed the surplus property law it created a new agency the objectives of which were, among others, in the words of the act itself:

"To give maximum aid in the reestablishment of a peacetime economy of free, independent private enterprise, the development of the maximum of independent operators in trade, industry, and agriculture.

"To discourage monopolistic practices and to strengthen and preserve the competitive position of small business concerned in an economy of free enterprise.

"To assure the sale of surplus property in such quantities and on such terms as will discourage disposal to speculators or for speculative purposes.

"To achieve the prompt and full utilization of surplus property at fair prices to the consumer through disposal at home and abroad with due regard for the protection of free markets and competitive prices from dislocation resulting from uncontrolled dumping.

"To foster the development of new independent enterprises."

In pursuance of these and the other purposes of the law, Congress wrote into it sections 19 and 20, requiring certain reports to be submitted to Congress and to the Attorney General in order that there might be no doubt that the Congress should retain the power of supervision and the Attorney General should be on guard to prevent increase of the economic concentration which was inevitable in the preparation for the war.

The law provided that the Surplus Property Board should prepare and submit reports with respect to certain classes of surplus property within 3 months after the enactment of the statute. The President signed the bill on October 3, 1944. No report has as yet appeared. There were many reasons for the delay, as already pointed out. Time was consumed in the nomination and confirmation of the members of the Board, in the selection and appointment of the staff, and the development of a working arrangement with the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, as well as in the allocation of appropriations. All of this may be regarded as demonstrating the magnitude of the task rather than as ground for specific criticism of the Board. It is known, however, that the Board has not been a unit in the preparation of the comparatively few regulations and the special orders which have been issued to date. This is all pointed up by the current resignation of the Chairman of the Board, former United States Senator Guy M. Gillette. It should not be overlooked that the Surplus Property Board has a policy-making function which has been delegated to it by Congress. Policy making is a congressional function and when exercised by an administrative bureau should be under the continuing supervision of the Congress.

The property which is to be handled is scattered all over the globe. In the European theater alone it is estimated by the War Department that we have property

valued at least \$4,500,000,000. Of this material, according to Generals Eisenhower and McNary, 70 percent is still battle worthy. According to the report of General Somervell to the War Contracts Subcommittee and to the special Senate Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, this material is now being divided into four categories. One for the use of the army of occupation, one to be transported to the Orient for the war, one to be brought back to the United States for training of troops and the fourth to be disposed of as surplus. The Army-Navy Liquidation Commission, of which Thomas D. McCabe is chairman, will within a week send a group abroad under Mr. James S. Knowlson as commissioner, to have charge, in cooperation with the FEA and the Surplus Property Board, of surplus property in the European theater. Mr. Livingston Short, acting in the same capacity in the Mediterranean theater, has recently returned from Italy in this connection. It is worthy of note that sixty 127-ton Diesel engines which were sent to France for purposes of the war are to be brought back to the United States for use of American railroads. Most of all the other railroad equipment, it is understood, would probably not be suitable for use here. The plan is to dispose of this property abroad for American dollars, if possible. Whatever is done, it would be difficult obviously, to overestimate the complexities of the task.

From every point of view the reconversion problem is one with which Congress must keep in constant touch if the people of the country as a whole, the several States, and local communities are to be given the opportunity to have a share in determining what policies and methods are to be followed. The War Contracts Subcommittee has been cooperating with the special Senate Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning and with the Small Business Committee. It has found all of the Government agencies, including the War and Navy Departments, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the Surplus Property Board, the War Production Board, War Manpower Commission, the Petroleum Administration for War and all the others ready at all times to work with the committees. The sums available to the Military Affairs Subcommittee will be cut off on June 30 and it is for the purpose of enabling the committee to continue the study that the Military Affairs Committee recommends the adoption of the resolution herewith reported. It would seem fitting that the standing legislative committee which worked upon drafting the original reconversion legislation should be equipped to carry on the continuing work relating to the operation of that legislation which Congress must undertake.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1069. A bill granting a pension to Frances Hays Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1070, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1071. A bill granting a pension to Walter John Gamel; and

S. 1072. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Ruby L. Jobes; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1073, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1074. A bill designating American Indian Day; and

S. 1075. A bill to provide payments to those suffering death or wounds in the massacre at Wounded Knee Creek on December 29, 1890 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1076. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as a result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1077. A bill for the relief of Oscar S. Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (by request):

S. 1078. A bill to foster the cooperative agricultural educational work of the extension services; to free the extension services from the performance of nongovernmental functions; and to promote economy in the expenditure of public funds for the conduct of cooperative agricultural extension work; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the treaty with the Indians of the Northwest Territory, known as the Treaty of Greene Ville; to the Committee on the Library.

(Mr. WILLIS introduced S. J. Res. 72, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS AS AIDES TO SENATORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on April 25 I proposed on the floor of the Senate that the Veterans' Administration lend a trained ex-serviceman employee to every Senator to assist him in handling veterans' problems. Today I am submitting this proposal in the form of a bill.

This bill, I trust, will be one additional indication of Congress' heartfelt desire to furnish full and adequate care to him who shall have borne the battle and to his widow and his orphan. By this bill Congress will help to make certain that veterans' legislation efficiently accomplishes the ends which Congress intended. This bill will be still another evidence of Congress' will to keep the faith with the finest group of men and women on earth—the patriotic millions who have so proudly worn the uniform of our Nation.

The bill provides that the Veterans' Administration shall build up a pool of competent ex-servicemen of World Wars I and II, trained and experienced in all matters pertaining to veterans' affairs. This pool shall be built up with the view in mind that a member of it will be made available upon written request to any Senator requesting the services of a veteran aide.

These aides will be Civil Service employees. They will be schooled in the regulations and procedures of the Veterans' Administration. They will be men of ability and character.

They will preferably be men who have seen the face of battle, who have gone through combat, and who have suffered combat disability. They will preferably

be men who have unfortunately suffered the loss of some physical faculty, an eye or a limb or an arm in the service of their country. Now their proven patriotic zeal will find renewed expression in a career of service to their former buddies. These aides with service-connected disabilities—and I trust their number will be proportionately large in this pool of trained assistants—will be a living proof to the Nation that Congress recognizes that our disabled veterans are priceless assets and in no way liabilities to our country. As true human assets, the disabled boys must be used to maximum advantage in all phases of our economic, social, and political life.

Upon the written request of any Senator, one aide shall be detailed by the Veterans' Administration to assist the Senator for specified or indefinite periods. The trained veteran assistant will receive and answer all inquiries and requests from servicemen of all United States wars, and from their families, pertaining to veterans' rights and privileges. The aide will serve as a liaison with the Veterans' Administration, other Federal and State agencies and with ex-servicemen's organizations in getting action on veterans' business loans, veterans' education, veterans' hospital care, disability pensions, civil-service preference, insurance, vocational rehabilitation and so on.

As time goes on, the veteran aide will be of increasing help to every Senator in enabling the latter to discharge his duties. As more and more servicemen are returned to civilian life, as the laws passed by a grateful Congress in their behalf grow in number and in provisions, as dynamic and constructive changes are made in existent veterans' legislation, as the veteran aide gets more and more practical experience, he will grow in stature and in utility. He will become an invaluable and indispensable link between the millions of ex-service men and women and their loved ones, and their United States Senators.

Ultimately, I expect that every Senator will have a full-time veteran aide detailed to his office. But even before the work load of veterans' cases requires such full-time work, the Veterans' Administration can start the machinery of building up the pool of competent men. It can begin to supplement its existent training facilities and courses insofar as necessary. The Veterans' Administration can begin almost immediately to make part-time loans of these men to Senators whose work load of veterans' correspondence and actions is already heavy.

We must not be "too little and too late" in this matter. We must not wait until the amount of Senatorial calls, visits, and correspondence on veterans' behalf assumes tidal wave proportions and becomes impossible for us to handle adequately. We must act now to insure that our veterans do not get a run-around, that their requests do not get stalled, do not get bogged in red tape. We must act so that they will receive prompt and adequate redress to any legitimate grievances they may have. We must act to fulfill their needs as individuals and as

a group as efficiently as they, on the field of battle, fulfilled our great need for the preservation of the Nation.

Already as of April 30, 1945, the Veterans' Administration has 466,000 active pension and compensation cases of living World War II veterans, as compared to 422,000 present cases of living World War I veterans. The Veterans' Administration has 67,000 cases on file for vocational rehabilitation of disabled veterans. It has 66,000 cases on file for education and training under the GI bill of rights. The Veterans' Administration has received and approved to date over 17,000,000 applications for National Service Life Insurance policies. It has already allowed claims on 185,000 such policies. It has authorized hospital treatment or domiciliary care for 80,000 beneficiaries of all United States wars.

These and other statistics reflect the vast and increasing responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration. These statistics, too, give us a picture of the heavy workload that will be placed in countless ways upon Members of the Senate in serving veteran constituents.

At the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress, we voted additional clerical allowances for our offices. It must be obvious to all, however, that the modest increase in our office staffs will not suffice to handle veterans' correspondence once it has reached its crest. Not only that, but neither we nor our present staffs possess the specialized knowledge about veterans' laws which will be so essential in properly serving our constituents.

We have never spared a penny in our appropriations to our servicemen while they were under arms. Now, we must make sure that all our past, present, and future appropriations for their behalf as civilians will actually accomplish the ends which we desire.

What a "shot in the arm" passage of this bill will prove to every American serviceman on the high seas or the far-flung continents! He will know that he is being represented in his United States Senator's office by a buddy who understands his problems, who talks his language, who feels his emotions, who has sweated and fought and suffered and toiled as he has, who is going to handle his inquiries and requests in a human and efficient manner.

My own State has furnished well more than a quarter million men and women to the armed forces. I want a Wisconsin serviceman in my office who will help me to be of maximum possible service to that vast number of his Badger buddies. And I want to see boys of all the other States working in Senators' offices for their former comrades-in-arms of every State in the Union.

The challenge is clear that we must be adequate to our high responsibility to our veterans. We must rise to that challenge and grow as that challenge grows.

The National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Mr. Milton D. Cohn, has already written to me of his enthusiasm for the principle of my bill. I welcome his expression, particularly because of the related program which his own organization has conceived with

broad vision and is already well on its way to realizing. That worthy program is for the thorough training at school and on the job of a large group of disabled veterans so that they may become national service officers of the DAV and thereby assist their disabled fellows.

I know that in veterans' rehabilitation, as well as in other matters, such splendid organizations as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans are continuing and expanding their invaluable services to the community and the individual veteran and his family. These organizations thus continue as a vital force in supplementing official governmental and private work on the veterans' behalf.

I trust that my bill will serve to enhance their efforts.

It is, therefore, with humble pride and pleasure that I introduce this bill. And it is with the fervent hope that it will be acted upon promptly and that it may contribute in a small way to repaying the only national debt which we can never repay in full—the debt which America owes to her veterans.

I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee and that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1070) to provide assistance in the rehabilitation of World War I and II veterans, to insure prompt and efficient disposition of correspondence and other inquiries received by Senators which relate to veterans' benefits, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs upon receipt of a written request therefor from a Senator, is authorized and directed to detail to the office of such Senator an employee of the Veterans' Administration who is a World War I or II veteran in the classified civil service and who has the qualifications, training, and experience necessary to insure prompt and satisfactory replies to and to take other appropriate action on correspondence and other inquiries received by the Senator on matters pertaining to monetary or other benefits or services under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That not more than one such employee shall be detailed during the same period to the office of any one Senator: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall determine the type of classified position established in the Veterans' Administration from which such details shall be made and shall establish such courses of training or instruction as may be necessary to meet the demands for such personnel under this act.

Sec. 2. The appropriations, salaries, and expenses, of the Veterans' Administration are hereby made available for expenditure under this act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

ADJUSTED-SERVICE COMPENSATION FOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "A bill to provide adjusted-service compensation for veterans of World War II," and I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a letter addressed to the veterans be printed in the RECORD

and that the letter be printed immediately preceding the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1073) to provide adjusted-service compensation for veterans of World War II was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and the bill and letter addressed to the veterans were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 31, 1945.

DEAR VETERAN: I want to see you aided in every possible way in order that you may return to a normal civilian life again now that you have finished your war service.

You should be given free vocational training, assisted in buying your own home, your own land, or your own business. This Nation should give you every assistance to enable you to make your own living.

The No. 1 problem for you will be a job. Then this Nation should help you to meet other problems—family, housing, or medical care.

With this in mind, I am introducing S. — providing for the adjusted-service compensation for veterans of World War II. This is a compensation proposal, not a bonus payment, for the men and women who have offered their services to their country in time of war.

We are all convinced that many provisions of the GI bill of rights cannot be effectively carried out. A grateful government should do its utmost to give you veterans a new start in life upon your discharge from the armed forces.

Unemployment will undoubtedly become severe after the war. Veterans who have been the last to be hired in private employment will be among the first to be discharged when the recession sets in and the pay rolls begin to shrink. With production cut-backs and lay-offs mounting at a tremendous pace as the war comes to a close, you veterans must be protected in the postwar era.

Widespread war-contract cancellations and unemployment reductions are daily occurring. We must provide adequate means of a livelihood and financial provisions that will enable you to readjust yourself to a productive life upon your return to civilian status again. We are all vitally concerned about this very important postwar predicament. We must set up safeguards to ease your future—you, our returning heroes.

To head off such a calamity facing you, I am proposing this adjusted-service compensation for honorably discharged men and women of World War II. This legislation is based on the length and place of service while in the armed forces. I want to give you a quick picture of your benefits under this bill.

It calls for a \$5.50 pay for each day of overseas service and \$2.75 per day for home duty, payable in Government bonds. The adjusted-service credit in no event will be more than \$10,000.

One of the most important provisions of this piece of legislation provides for a speedy turn-over of bonds for the purchase of farms or surplus property at the disposal of the United States Government.

The issuance and redemption of the bonds will be under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the details to be worked out after the passage of the bill.

Full payment on the bond becomes due after a period of 10 years. During this time the bond draws an interest of 3 percent.

In section 7 the bond is protected from unwarranted legal manipulations and free from additional income tax. However, the bond will be subject to taxation only on interest, the same as in War Savings bonds, etc.

I think this bill should be passed. I would like to see a copy of this proposal in the hands of every veteran for his consideration and approval. I need your support in the

hope of getting this bill approved. I want you veterans to discuss this measure thoroughly and write me regarding your wishes. With your help, this bill will become the law of the land. Write for as many copies as you can use. The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Adjusted Compensation Act of 1945."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "active military service" means active service in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, including their respective reserve components, or the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and service of an officer of the Public Health Service while detailed by proper authority for duty either with the Army or the Navy.

(b) The term "oversea service" means service while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the head of the department concerned, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

(c) The term "home service" means any service not oversea service.

(d) The term "Department concerned" means the War Department or the Navy Department, whichever may be the appropriate one in the particular case.

(e) The term "veteran" means any person who performs or has performed any active military service during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President.

ADJUSTED-SERVICE CREDIT

SEC. 3. (a) An adjusted-service credit shall be computed by the Secretary of the Department concerned for each veteran. The amount of the adjusted-service credit of any such veteran shall be computed by allowing the following sums for each day of active military service performed by such veteran during the period beginning on August 27, 1940, and ending 6 months after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President: \$5.50 for each day of oversea service, and \$2.75 for each day of home service; but not more than \$10,000 credit shall be allowed in the case of any veteran.

(b) In computing the adjusted-service credit no allowance shall be made—

(1) for service as a commissioned officer above the grade of captain in the Army or above the corresponding grade in any of the other services;

(2) for service under a permanent commission or permanent warrant in any of the services, or (while holding such a commission or warrant) service under a temporary commission in a higher grade;

(3) for service as a civilian officer or employee of any branch of the military or naval forces, contract surgeon, cadet, or midshipman of the United States Military Academy, Naval Academy, or Coast Guard Academy, or member of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for service while attending or stationed at an educational institution and undergoing a course of instruction prescribed to last longer than 6 months, or for service as a member of the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular forces of the Navy, the Samoan native guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps;

(4) in the case of persons entering upon active military service after the end of the period of hostilities in the present war, for service performed after so entering upon active military service;

(5) for service as a commissioned or warrant officer performing home service not with troops and receiving commutation of quarters or of subsistence, except that an allow-

ance for such service may be included in the case of any person if and to the extent that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy jointly find that such service subjected such person to exceptional hazard; and

(6) in the case of any individual whose period of active military service is terminated under other than honorable conditions after the beginning of the period of hostilities in the present war.

ISSUANCE OF BONDS

SEC. 4. (a) The amount of the adjusted-service credit of any person shall be paid by the Secretary of the Department concerned in bonds of the United States in denominations of \$50 having a total face value up to the highest multiple of \$50 in the amount of the adjusted-service credit of the veteran, and the difference between the amount of such credit and the face amount of the bonds so issued shall be paid by the Secretary of the Department concerned out of such sums as may be appropriated for that purpose.

(b) The Secretary of the Department concerned shall permit any veteran, as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this act and at any time thereafter prior to the payment of the adjusted-service credit of such veteran under subsection (a), to designate a beneficiary to whom such payment shall be made in event of the prior death of the veteran, or to whom any bond issued in making such payment shall be payable if such bond is issued to the veteran and he dies prior to its redemption. Payment under subsection (a) shall be made to the veteran if he is living at the time such payment is made, or, if he be incompetent, to the representative of his estate. If the veteran is deceased at the time such payment is made, payment shall be made to the beneficiary, if any, designated under this subsection, and if there be no such beneficiary, payment shall be made to the estate of the veteran: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Department concerned may make payment to the person or persons determined by such Secretary to be lawfully entitled thereto, without the necessity of appointment by judicial proceedings or otherwise of a legal representative of the estate of the veteran or of any other person, or of compliance with State law in respect of the administration of estates: *Provided further*, That the amount of any such payment which, under the law of the State or country pursuant to which the estate of the deceased veteran would be distributed would otherwise escheat to such State or country, shall escheat to the United States and shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) (1) In the case of any veteran who has been discharged or otherwise released from active military service, or who has died, prior to the date of enactment of this act, (A) payment under subsection (a) shall be made as soon as practicable after such date of enactment, (B) bonds issued in making such payment shall be issued as of the beginning of the month in which such date of enactment occurs, (C) payment under subsection (a) shall be made only upon application filed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Department concerned, and (D) the Secretary of the Department concerned shall, as soon as practicable, mail to the last-known address of the veteran, or the representative of his estate, or such other person as may be determined by such Secretary to be appropriate, a notice of their right to apply for the benefits of this section.

(2) In the case of any veteran who is discharged or otherwise released from active military service, or who dies, upon or after the date of enactment of this act and prior to the expiration of 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war

as proclaimed by the President, payment under subsection (a) shall be made upon or as soon as practicable after the date of discharge or release from active military service or death, and the bonds issued in making such payment shall be issued as of the beginning of the month in which such discharge, release, or death occurs or such furlough begins.

(3) In the case of any veteran who is in the active military service upon the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President payment under subsection (a) shall be made upon or as soon as practicable after the expiration of such 6 months, and bonds issued in making such payment shall be issued as of the beginning of the month in which such 6 months expires.

(d) The bonds issued under this section—
(1) shall be issued under the authority and subject to the provisions of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended;

(2) shall not be transferable or assignable except as provided in section 5;

(3) shall mature 10 years after the date of issuance and shall be redeemable by the Secretary of the Treasury at any time after the date of such maturity; and

(4) shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to provide for the issuance and redemption of bonds under this section in order to carry out the purposes of this act; but insofar as such regulations relate to functions to be performed by any other department or agency of the Government, they shall be subject to the approval of the head of such other department or agency.

PURCHASE OF FARMS AND SURPLUS PROPERTY

SEC. 5. (a) Any veteran to whom any bond has been issued under section 4 and who desires to use the proceeds of such bond prior to its maturity in order to purchase land to be used by him in farming operations conducted by him, or in order to purchase any property disposed of by the United States under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, may assign such bond in connection with such purchase.

(b) Any bond assigned with the approval of the Secretary under this section shall be redeemable from the assignee at any time, upon presentation for redemption in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Such bond shall be redeemed by paying the face value and accrued interest thereon to the date of assignment, and no interest shall accrue after such date of assignment.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The benefits provided by this act shall be in addition to any other benefits provided by law with respect to persons who have performed active military service or their dependents.

(b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall, as soon as practicable, prepare and publish a pamphlet or pamphlets containing an explanation of the provisions of this act; and shall from time to time thereafter prepare and publish such additional or supplementary information as may be found necessary. The publications provided for in this section shall be distributed in such manner as the Administrator determines to be most effective to inform veterans and their beneficiaries and estates of their rights under this act.

SEC. 7. (a) No amount payable under this act to a veteran or his beneficiary or estate, no bond issued under this act, and no proceeds of any such bond shall be subject to attachment, levy, or seizure under any legal or equitable process, or be regarded as income for the purposes of National or State taxation, except that interest upon such bonds shall be subject to taxation as in the case of

War Savings bonds of series E issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended.

(b) No deduction on account of any indebtedness of a veteran or his beneficiary or estate to the United States shall be made from the adjusted-service credit of any veteran or from any amounts payable under this act to any veteran or his beneficiary or estate.

SEC. 8. (a) Any officer charged with any function under this act shall make such regulations, not inconsistent with this act, as may be necessary for the efficient administration of such function.

(b) Any officer charged with any function under this act may delegate and provide for the delegation of such function to any other officer or employee of the United States. No such delegation shall be made by an officer in any department or agency to an officer or employee in any other department or agency, except with the consent of the head of such other department or agency.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. (a) Any person who knowingly makes any false or fraudulent statement of a material fact in any application or other document made under the provisions of this act, or made in order to secure any of the benefits of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

(b) Any person who charges or collects, or attempts to charge or collect, either directly or indirectly, any fee or other compensation for assisting in any manner a veteran or his beneficiary in obtaining any of the benefits of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

SPECIAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO ERNIE PYLE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, recently, in conjunction with my colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH and Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], I introduced a joint resolution proposing to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Ernie Pyle. I have been advised by the Committee on Military Affairs that this medal is always restricted to men who have had military connections.

Therefore, today I introduce for myself, my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH and Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a special medal of honor to the late Ernie Pyle.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a special medal of honor to Ernie Pyle, introduced by Mr. WILLIS (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3306) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, was read twice by its

title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

WALTER L. JACKSON AND THE CITY-COUNTY HOSPITAL—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at the last call of the calendar the Senate passed the bill (H. R. 1260) for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital.

Since that time I have been informed that the claim of Walter L. Jackson and the City-County Hospital, as incorporated in this bill, has been paid and discharged by the War Department. I now move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PEARL HARBOR INCIDENT—EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 306, Senate joint resolution 66.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) to extend the statute of limitations in certain cases.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I may say that the extension of the statute of limitations applies to anybody who might have been guilty in connection with the Pearl Harbor disaster.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Resolved, etc., That effective as of December 7, 1943, all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations, affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty or crime or offense against the United States, that operate to prevent the court martial, prosecution, trial, or punishment of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any matter in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty or crime or offense against the United States, are hereby extended, in addition to the extensions provided for in Public Laws 208, 339, and 489, Seventy-eighth Congress, for a further period ending 6 months after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war with Japan as proclaimed by the President or as specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, whichever is the earlier.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave of absence for a week will be granted the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], for reasons stated in a letter addressed by him to the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] be excused from service in the Senate today. He will be absent on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave of absence is granted the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], may be excused for the period of a week. He has been called to North Dakota on business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave of absence for a week is granted the junior Senator from North Dakota.

RECONVERSION AND FULL EMPLOYMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MURRAY before the Chicago Reconversion Conference, Illinois Manufacturers' Association and the National Association of Manufacturers, at Chicago on May 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime Will Destroy Government by the People," delivered by him at Gettysburg National Cemetery, May 30, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHERE DO WE GO FROM SAN FRANCISCO—REMARKS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD remarks on the subject Where Do We Go From San Francisco?, delivered by Senator ELLENDER in the Free Speech Forum on May 29, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jefferson Day Dinner address delivered by Senator JOHNSTON, at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on May 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECORATION DAY SERVICE AT GRAVE OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT—ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK C. WALKER

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Frank C. Walker, former Postmaster General, at the memorial service at the grave of Franklin D. Roosevelt, under the auspices of the Roosevelt Home Club, Hyde Park, N. Y., on May 30, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL CEREMONY AT MUIR WOODS IN MEMORY OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Capt. Richard L. Neuberger and the proceedings incident to exercises held on May 19 in Muir Woods, Calif., in memory of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, which appear in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY ENSIGN HUDSON HYATT, UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Memorial Day address by Ensign Hudson Hyatt, USNR, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH FEATURES OF SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1945

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record letters addressed to him by Dr. Ernest P. Boas, chairman of the Physicians Forum, a statement issued by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and a statement issued by Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, endorsing S. 1050, entitled "The Social Security Amendments of 1945," which appear in the Appendix.]

BILLIONTH GALLON OF HIGH OCTANE GAS PRODUCED AT BATON ROUGE, LA., REFINERY

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a news release relative to the billionth gallon of high-octane aviation gasoline produced by the Standard Oil of New Jersey refinery at Baton Rouge, La., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FEPC BILL

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement by the mayor of a California city setting forth his objections to a resolution of the board of supervisors approving assembly bill No. 3, the California Fair Employment Practices Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESETTLEMENT OF WEST AFRICA BY NEGROES

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter from W. L. Jackson, of Baltimore, Md., regarding the resettlement of West Africa by American Negroes, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "A River and an Issue," published in the May 21, 1945, issue of the Omaha Evening World-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

OBSERVANCE OF INDEPENDENCE WEEK—PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF INDIANA

[Mr. WILLIS, on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a proclamation by the Governor of Indiana urging the observance in the State of Indiana of Independence Week from June 30 to July 4, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAUL T. THOMPSON

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 905) for the relief of Paul T. Thompson, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN SUBSIDY PAYMENTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the

House of Representatives to the bill (S. 502) to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. MILLIKIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3024, the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader what his pleasure is so far as the visiting guests are concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at 12:30 o'clock visiting guests from Iraq are to be present, and it is desired that Senators be given an opportunity to meet them. I thought we would take a brief recess, have the distinguished guests escorted into the Chamber, and afford Senators the pleasure of greeting and shaking hands with them. In order that as many as possible may be present, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for that purpose?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Gerry	Morse
Barkley	Green	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hart	Overton
Briggs	Hatch	Pepper
Buck	Hayden	Shipstead
Burton	Hickenlooper	Smith
Bushfield	Hoey	Taft
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Wagner
Chandler	Johnston, S. C.	Walsh
Chavez	La Follette	White
Cordon	Langer	Wiley
Donnell	McKellar	Willis
Ellender	McMahon	Wilson
Fulbright	Magnuson	
George	Moore	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent visiting battlefields in Europe.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are absent in Europe on official business for the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on official business in Europe for the Interstate Commerce Committee.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, is inspecting the Philippine Islands and therefore is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent on official business of the Senate as members of the Mead committee.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are absent on official business of the Senate as members of a subcommittee of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS ABDUL ILAH, REGENT AND HEIR APPARENT TO THE THRONE OF IRAQ

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, His Royal Highness Abdul Ilah, Regent and Heir Apparent to the Throne of Iraq; the Honorable Ali Jawdat, Minister of Iraq to the United States of America; and His Excellency Nuri Pash As-Said, former Prime Minister of Iraq, are in the Vice President's room as guests of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until a quarter to 1, in order that these distinguished guests may be escorted into the Chamber and Senators may meet them individually.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess for 15 minutes.

During the recess,

His Royal Highness Prince Abdul Ilah, Regent of Iraq, escorted by Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and accompanied by the Honorable Ali Jawdat, Minister of Iraq to the United States; His Excellency Nuri Pasha As-Said, former Prime Minister of Iraq; His Excellency Daud Pasha Al-Haidari, former Minister of Iraq to London; Lt. Col. Ubayd Abdallah, aide-de-camp to the Regent; Dr. H. C. Sinderson Pasha, physician to the Regent; Mr. Raymond D. Muir, representative of the Department of State; Brig. Gen. Robert C. Oliver, United States military aide; and Capt. Arthur H. McCollum, United States naval aide, preceded by the Secretary [Leslie L. Biffle] and the Sergeant at Arms [Wall Doxey] entered the Chamber.

His Royal Highness Abdul Ilah was escorted to a position on the floor of the Senate in front of the Vice President's desk, and was there greeted by Members of the Senate, who were introduced to him by Mr. BARKLEY.

Following the informal reception His Royal Highness Abdul Ilah and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

On the expiration of the recess (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the President pro tempore.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES IN FRAMING A JUST PEACE AND A WORKABLE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the world stands today at one of the great crossroads of history. The United States must determine the course it is to follow. As I see it there are two alternatives.

One is to wash our hands of the whole business and refuse to take on the responsibilities our participation in the war has thrust upon us. I do not believe we should do this.

Instead I believe that we should face the new responsibilities that our decisive role in the war has brought upon us. I believe we should strive to create a realistic international organization which will actually work, and to create a peace settlement which will endure. Past experience teaches us that to achieve this purpose both the peace settlement and the world organization must be rooted in principles of justice.

I am profoundly convinced that the United States should throw her moral strength into the international balance to tip the scales on the side of justice and liberty, just as America threw her military strength into the balance that tipped the scales against nazism, fascism, and militarism.

But this does not mean that we must give indiscriminating support to every proposal submitted to us by our allies or by some of our own spokesmen simply because it is advanced in the name of nebulous internationalism. It is easy to get individuals and nations to agree upon vague, general statements of idealistic purposes. The conflicts arise when the terms of a bargain begin to be specific. Verbal idealism does not cost anyone anything. Practical idealism comes high, for it demands mutual sacrifices and constant cooperation in the achievement of a common purpose. It is harder to achieve this practical idealism in peace than in war. If we are to be committed to deep-going international cooperation, we must be on the alert in behalf of true democracy and justice.

And we shall be less than alert if we do not keep the record of the past vividly before us in charting our course for the future. Any plans for international cooperation which ignore the lessons of the past are unrealistic.

WE MUST LOOK TO THE PAST TO PREVENT TRAGIC MISTAKES IN THE FUTURE

Recent history within the memory of living men should protect us from repeating past mistakes. Therefore, in

discussing the international problems of the present I wish to set them against the back drop of the past. We must constantly remember that no permanent peace can be based on wrong, and that no world organization can be formed strong enough to maintain a bad peace.

The decisions as to the vital elements of the peace settlements will be infinitely more important for your children and mine than any decision at San Francisco regarding the mechanics of enforcing peace. In common with men and women everywhere who long for enduring peace after this global holocaust ends, I have followed the developments at San Francisco closely during these past weeks.

I do not discuss those developments for the moment, but shall come to them presently. I should like to say first that I feel a deepening apprehension that the purpose, program, and possibilities of the Conference have been oversold to the American people, and doubtless to other peoples of the world.

I recall an anecdote told of the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. When asked to give the prime requirement for a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, he replied, "Always to remember that one is not God."

That was an admonition that we Americans should constantly keep in mind in thinking about the Dumbarton Oaks-Yalta proposals which have been under discussion at San Francisco. These proposals are not in themselves a peace plan. They are an incomplete and imperfect arrangement resulting from compromise designed to enforce the peace settlements which are now being made or will be made in the future.

The people of this country have been bombarded from all sides with the dangerous delusion that the San Francisco Conference is the beginning and the end of the peacemaking process. For weeks a sustained, misleading propaganda has been carried on to put over the fantastic idea that the future peace and security of the world depended solely on the outcome of this Conference.

I do not minimize the importance of the San Francisco Conference. But it is vital to make clear that the San Francisco Conference is dealing only with an effort to devise machinery to enforce the peace. The task of the final peace settlements and the task of attempting to build a more secure tomorrow for the world will remain to be done after the San Francisco Conference shall have adjourned. The past should teach us that the most beautifully worded and cleverly contrived instrument of enforcement that the United Nations can possibly devise will fail if the final peace settlements are not firmly grounded in principles of justice.

A JUST PEACE IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE MECHANICS OF ENFORCEMENT

Even more important than any decisions at San Francisco on the mechanics of enforcement are the decisions which are being made, and must be made later as to the actual peace settlements. Any enduring peace must ultimately depend upon the decisions as to what finally happens in Poland, Italy, Greece, Burma,

Malay, the Philippines, and in other areas liberated from the yoke of Axis tyranny. It also depends upon what is done with conquered Germany and Japan. It depends, too, upon how the urgent problems of imperialism, competitive armaments, world trade, natural resources, and slave labor are determined.

The United States has played a leading, decisive role in this war. For the second time in 27 years we have thrown the power of the United States into a world war. We have been the decisive factor once more in determining the outcome of a world war.

But from now on we must remember the past and not again make the mistake of putting too much faith in the machinery to enforce peace or in fine phrases about internationalism.

Americans should constantly remember that nebulous internationalism was used during the First World War as a cloak to cover the secret bargains of war-breeding imperialism which were finally disclosed at Versailles. Such secret bargains betray the freedom-loving peoples of all lands. If we are to engage in international cooperation for enduring peace, America should use all her power to uphold a standard which expresses the aspirations of the peoples of all creeds and colors for political freedom and economic opportunity—a standard which would proclaim to the entire world America's aspirations in that peacemaking and in continued international cooperation.

WE HAVE MUCH TO LEARN FROM THE PAST

We have much to learn from the tragic drama of Versailles in 1918-19, when the leaders of the victorious nations, then led by a Big Four, wrote the peace settlement which exploded scarcely 20 years later in the present global war.

I am convinced that no one who studies objectively the causes of the present holocaust can escape the judgment that this war is a malignant outgrowth from the seeds planted, however unwittingly, by the allied leaders who thought they were peacemakers. Unless we learn greater wisdom from this disastrous past experience, we shall repeat in our own time some of their most perilous mistakes.

No one who reads the record of that period and searches honestly through the memoirs of the principal participants, can avoid the melancholy conclusion that when the allied diplomats abandoned principle in favor of short-sighted expediency, relied upon force instead of justice, and betrayed the promises to conquered, neutral, and subject peoples, they sowed the seeds of the present war.

The first great error made by the United States was its failure to use America's enormous bargaining power in our relations with our allies in the First World War. In the present war we have repeated this tragic mistake. Our bargaining power should have been used before we entered the war in 1917 and continuously thereafter—not to secure selfish ends for the United States, but to advance democratic principles in all countries, and to formulate a just peace

settlement in accord with the war aims publicly declared in the Fourteen Points.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know whether the Senator cares to be interrupted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that the point just made by the Senator from Wisconsin in a very able manner is most important and one which has been lost sight of by the administration in the conduct of our international affairs in the last few years. I think the Senator is to be commended for bringing it out in so emphatic a way.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate the able Senator's comment and I wish to say in justification of this review of the past that this is not the only example of the deadly parallel which will develop as I proceed with my remarks.

WE FAILED TO USE OUR BARGAINING POWER IN WORLD WAR I

During the First World War, at the time President Wilson announced these war aims in his famous Fourteen Points speech, they were publicly endorsed in principle by Allied leaders. That was the time to have insisted upon their making specific public commitments to join the United States in writing the peace with the Fourteen Points as its basis. But later, because in 1917 our bargaining power had not been used wisely and courageously, the victories won on the battlefields under the banner of our publicly declared war aims were secretly betrayed at the peace table in Versailles.

SECRECY IN 1917-18 WAS A GREAT ERROR

Another great error was made when it was agreed to hold the conferences in secret. At that moment President Wilson's power to write his Fourteen Points into the treaty was further weakened, if not destroyed. Many of the war-breeding decisions at the peace table could have been avoided if President Wilson had insisted on his publicly declared principle that open covenants should be openly arrived at. Had discussion been open, the American people and the democratic-minded peoples of Europe who had acclaimed President Wilson upon his arrival in Paris would have supported him.

Evidence of the disastrous results of these two great strategic errors in 1917 and 1918 are to be found in the published memoirs and in the biographies of nearly all the principal men who negotiated at Paris and Versailles. There, day by day, in secret conferences, the selfish imperialistic purposes of the men then in power in the governments of our allies steadily undermined both an enduring peace and an effective League of Nations. At the peace table they betrayed the democratic-minded, liberty-loving peoples of all countries, defeated the war aims declared by President Wilson, and wrote a treaty largely in accord with the provisions of the secret treaties which the Allied governments had made among themselves before the United States entered World War I. Those secret

treaties contained the seeds of future wars. The time to have secured their public repudiation by the Allies was when victory was uncertain and our help was therefore most desperately needed. At that time I believe the Allies could have been publicly committed to specific terms of a democratic peace. Had this been done, the peoples of the Allied countries and the people of our own country who thought they were fighting a war for democracy and enduring peace would have held their governments to the kind of peace that had been publicly pledged.

CONTEMPORARY RECORDS SHOW HOW OUR WAR AIMS WERE UNDERMINED IN WORLD WAR I

Evidence as to how America's war aims—once acclaimed by Allied leaders—were secretly undermined can be found in contemporary records published long after the treaty was written. By putting together the pieces of the published contemporary letters, memoranda, and diary notes we can find valuable testimony which should be studied now and used to help us avoid repeating the tragic pattern of the past in the peace conferences which will probably follow the present war. This testimony is recorded in the memoirs and biographies of the men who participated in or watched silently the proceedings of the peace conferences. Outstanding among these records are:

Colonel Stephen Bonsal's *Unfinished Business*, which recently won the Pulitzer prize; *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*; the *Peace Negotiations*, by Robert Lansing, then Secretary of State and a member of the American Peace Commission; the contemporary letters and memoranda found in the biographies of two able men appointed to the American Peace Commission by President Wilson, one, the biography of General Tasker H. Bliss by Frederick Palmer; the other the biography of Henry White by Professor Allan Nevins; illuminating material is also found in the memoirs of Lloyd George, and the writings of Ray Stannard Baker, who was closely associated with President Wilson during the peace conferences.

It has been the fashion in certain circles to blame practically every international disaster that has occurred from 1920 to 1939 upon the refusal of the United States Senate to ratify the Treaty of Versailles in precisely the form submitted by President Wilson. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Versailles treaty failed because it was an unrealistic treaty, founded upon injustice and dismemberment, and above all because it did not solve the basic social and economic causes which history shows are the root of most wars. No international organization, with or without the aid of the United States, would have been strong enough to have enforced the utterly inadequate, unwise, and unworkable Treaty of Versailles, framed in secrecy, based upon intrigues of secret diplomacy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very much interested in the statement the Senator has just made. Would he care to be a little more explicit as to the respects in which the Treaty of Versailles was so bad and so unjust?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should be glad to go into it. I can say to the Senator that I think that the main provisions of the treaty which were so unworkable and so bad were those which carried out, either completely or in part, the secret treaties, which had been entered into by the nations which became our allies and associates before the United States became involved in the war. I do not desire, unless the Senator insists, because I have a rather long speech, to go into the details of the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles which I hold were unwise, unworkable, and unenforceable, but I shall be glad, if the Senator desires me to do so, to give him a statement concerning that subject when I speak at some other time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I realize there were many complex provisions. To take just one, I wonder if the Senator would care to say that in its treatment of Germany he feels that the treaty was so unjust and harsh upon Germany as to be a factor. It was not a part of a secret treaty, but it was a major part of what followed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I see it, there were two policies which could have been adopted at Versailles. One was a Carthaginian type of peace, the other was a peace which would have been predicated upon the theory at that time that there were democratic forces in Germany which could have taken leadership, and that a peace should have been written which it was possible for such a democratic government to have fulfilled. But as I see it, the Versailles Treaty did neither. It stopped half way between, and contained all the evils of both alternatives, and practically none of the benefits. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Except that the Senator would not say that it was either too harsh or too easy?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I say that it went far enough in the direction of a Carthaginian peace to make it impossible for the democratic government in Germany to survive. Yet it did not go far enough, if the terms of the treaty itself were to be presumed to have accomplished the complete obliteration of Germany as a possible or potential military power.

On the other hand, if the Senator will bear with me, in this review of history which I am making, solely for the purpose of searching it for helpful guides and objectives in the present crisis, I shall in a few minutes direct the attention of the Senator, if he is still present, to what I think were the mistakes made by the two principal and dominant allied countries in relation to the developments under the treaty itself.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One more observation. The Senator started out by saying that we have oversold the San Francisco Conference. Is it not true that

the Senator was expecting a little too much of the Versailles Treaty? In view of what has happened, the defects in our conduct, and not only ours, but of the various other nations, in succeeding years after the Versailles Conference we cannot expect any peace treaty to solve all existing political and economic problems.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my thesis that we must study the past to obtain guidance and help in meeting the critical, complex problems which confront us today, and which will continue to confront us in the future. I think the people who have paid the price in blood and treasure have a right to expect and to demand, that we shall learn something from the tragic lessons of the past and that we shall not repeat the same fatal mistakes. The people have earned the right to demand that we shall make the effort to eliminate the basic social and economic causes which contribute to war. Otherwise, these heroic sacrifices will have been in vain, if we are to repeat the same mistakes again, and create another situation in which the people will be called upon once more to sacrifice their blood and treasure in another and more terrible war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with that. My thought is that it is not all dependent upon some treaty, it is dependent on a continuing policy or course of conduct which goes on all the time, and not just one treaty.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have emphasized over and over again, in my earlier remarks, that it is a problem of continuous cooperation, and I shall emphasize before I conclude that when the San Francisco Conference is finished, and if the instrument is ratified by the various governments, it would be a grievous error to conclude that we have solved the problem of preserving peace as I know many people believed it was solved in the 1920's when the Versailles Treaty was adopted, and the League of Nations was set up in the marble palace at Geneva.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is one reason why we should not attach too much importance to the assumed deficiencies of the Versailles Treaty to which the Senator referred. It was just an incident in this long process.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think it was more than an incident, and a study of history and the contemporary comments of those who were in the conferences at Paris and Versailles, I think will show, as I come to quote them, that they saw that the treaty itself was unworkable, and that the League, therefore, could not succeed in its announced objectives. They saw it on the spot, before the ink was dry on the Versailles Treaty.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I think the Senator is rendering a very great service in making this contribution to the present studies. I should like to ask if history does not record, or if the Senator's studies do not reveal, the oft-quoted statement that Germany signed the armistice on the understanding that the treaty of peace

would be based on the Fourteen Points announced by Mr. Wilson.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is a conflict of opinion among historians on that score. Certainly the Germans claimed subsequently that they had relied upon the statement of the Fourteen Points when they asked for the armistice. The best book which I have read on that subject is one entitled "The Armistice, 1918," by Harry Rudolph Rudin, and published by the Yale University Press in 1944.

Mr. WILLIS. If it be true that Germany signed the armistice under the representation that the treaty of peace would be based on the Fourteen Points, and the nations failed to observe those Fourteen Points, is not that reason enough for the failure of the treaty and of the League?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That may have been a factor in the situation, it may have contributed somewhat to the attitude which finally developed and the political environment which developed in some of the Allied countries, but certainly it was the propaganda device which Hitler subsequently used in his rise to power. But I do not wish to pass definite historical judgment upon the question as to the extent of the Germans' reliance upon the Fourteen Points, because the issue is in controversy. I think it was a factor, but how great a factor, or what part it played, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. WILLIS. But this conclusion we can draw, can we not, that unless we adhere strictly to the representations we make, we cannot expect any permanent peace?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think there is much in what the Senator says. I think the only way we can build up lasting international relationships is on the basis of faith between nations, just as we build up relationships in the social intercourse between individuals.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. At Paris in 1919 there were experts from the United States and other countries, including some members of the American Peace Commission appointed by President Wilson, who knew it to be true that the treaty was unworkable, and privately recorded their opinions to this effect before the ink was scarcely dry on the Treaty of Versailles.

But these men were powerless to prevent the disastrous concessions they thought the President was making in the peace treaty in order to win support for the League of Nations, which he mistakenly believed could right these wrongs.

MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES PEACE MISSION SAW
VERSAILLES TREATY WAS UNWORKABLE

The day after the Treaty of Versailles was delivered to the German plenipotentiaries, Secretary of State Robert Lansing discussed the treaty with William C. Bullitt, who was then an assistant in our Department of State and an attaché to the American Peace Commission. In a contemporary memorandum Mr. Lansing recorded the views he expressed to Mr. Bullitt regarding the treaty and the

League of Nations. The following quotation is an excerpt from this memorandum, which can be found in full on page 272 of Robert Lansing's book entitled "The Peace Negotiations":

The terms of peace appear immeasurably harsh and humiliating, while many of them seem to me impossible of performance.

The League of Nations created by the treaty is relied upon to preserve the artificial structure which has been erected by compromise of the conflicting interests of the Great Powers and to prevent the germination of the seeds of war which are sown in so many articles and which under normal conditions would soon bear fruit. The League might as well attempt to prevent the growth of plant life in a tropical jungle. Wars will come sooner or later.

It must be admitted, in honesty, that the League is an instrument of the mighty to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations among those who have been rendered impotent by defeat. Examine the treaty, and you will find peoples delivered against their wills into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequences of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed people are able to throw off the yoke, but as sure as day follows night the time will come when they will make the effort.

This war was fought by the United States to destroy forever the conditions which produced it. Those conditions have not been destroyed. They have been supplanted by other conditions equally productive of hatred, jealousy, and suspicion. In place of the Triple Alliance and the Entente has arisen the quintuple alliance which is to rule the world. The victors in this war intend to impose their combined will upon the vanquished and to subordinate all interests to their own.

It is true that to please the aroused public opinion of mankind and to respond to the idealism of the moralist they have surrounded the new alliance with a halo and called it the League of Nations, but whatever it may be called or however it may be disguised it is an alliance of the five great military powers.

It is useless to close our eyes to the fact that the power to compel obedience by the exercise of the united strength of "the five" is the fundamental principle of the League. Justice is secondary. Might is primary.

The League as now constituted will be the prey of greed and intrigue; and the law of unanimity in the Council, which may offer a restraint, will be broken or render the organization powerless. It is called upon to stamp as just what is unjust.

We have a treaty of peace, but it will not bring permanent peace because it is founded on the shifting sands of self-interest.

Mr. Lansing visited London a few days later and discussed the treaty with several of the leading British statesmen. After talking with them he noted their opinions thus:

The consensus was that the treaty was unwise and unworkable, that it was conceived in intrigue and fashioned in cupidity, and that it would produce rather than prevent wars.

One of these leaders of political thought in Great Britain told Mr. Lansing that—

The only apparent purpose of the League of Nations seems to be to perpetuate the series of unjust provisions which were being imposed.

MR. BULLITT RESIGNS

Soon after his talk with Secretary Lansing, Mr. Bullitt tendered his resignation from the Department of State and as an attaché to the American Peace Commission. The reasons for this resignation were stated in two letters, both dated May 17, 1919. One was a letter to Colonel House. The other was a letter to President Wilson which Bullitt asked Colonel House to bring to the attention of the President.

MY DEAR COLONEL HOUSE: Since you kindly lent me the text of the proposed treaty of peace, I have tried to convince myself that some good might come of it and that I ought to remain in the service of the Department of State to labor for its establishment. It is with sincere regret that I have come to the conviction that no good ever will issue from a thing so evil and that those who care about a permanent peace should oppose the signature and ratification of it, and of the special understanding with France.

I have, therefore, submitted my resignation to the Secretary of State and have written the appended note to the President. I hope you will bring it to his attention; not because he will care what I may think, but because I have expressed the thoughts which are in the minds of many young and old men in the Commission—thoughts which the President will have to reckon with when the world begins to reap the crop of wars the seeds of which have here been sown.

I feel sure that you will agree that I am right in acting on my conviction and I hope that this action will in no way affect the relationship between us which has always been so delightful and stimulating to me.

With my sincerest personal regards, I am,
Very respectfully yours,

WILLIAM C. BULLITT.

To the Honorable EDWARD M. HOUSE,
Hotel Crillon, Paris.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have submitted today to the Secretary of State my resignation as an assistant in the Department of State, attaché to the American commission to negotiate peace. I was one of the millions who trusted confidently and implicitly in your leadership and believed that you would take nothing less than a permanent peace based upon unselfish and unbiased justice. But our Government has consented now to deliver the suffering peoples of the world to new oppressions, subjections, and dismembersments—a new century of war. And I can convince myself no longer that effective labor for a new world order is possible as a servant of this Government.

Russia, "the acid test of good will," for me as for you, has not even been understood. Unjust decisions of the conference in regard to Shantung, the Tyrol, Thrace, Hungary, East Prussia, Danzig, the Saar Valley, and the abandonment of the principle of the freedom of the seas make new international conflicts certain. It is my conviction that the present League of Nations will be powerless to prevent these wars, and that the United States will be involved in them by the obligations undertaken in the Covenant of the League and in the special understanding with France. Therefore the duty of the Government of the United States to its own people and to mankind is to refuse to sign or ratify this unjust treaty, to refuse to guarantee its settlements by entering the League of Nations, to refuse to entangle the United States further by the understanding with France.

That you personally opposed most of the unjust settlements, and that you accepted them only under great pressure, is well known. Nevertheless, it is my conviction that if you had made your fight in the open, instead of behind closed doors, you would

have carried with you the public opinion of the world, which was yours; you would have been able to resist the pressure and might have established the new international order based upon broad and universal principles of right and justice of which you used to speak. I am sorry that you did not fight our fight to the finish and that you had so little faith in the millions of men, like myself, in every nation who had faith in you.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. BULLITT.

To the Honorable WOODROW WILSON,
President of the United States.

I recall vividly the sensation which these letters caused. They were among the first public indications that the secret sessions at Versailles had resulted in a betrayal of the Fourteen Points, and a treaty framed largely on the iniquitous secret treaties of our allies had been drawn.

On June 6, 1919, a month after the treaty was handed to the German plenipotentiaries, Gen. Tasker H. Bliss wrote to his wife:

The treaty as it stands is unworkable.
* * * The Americans pointed out its defects, but the Allies would not listen to them.

SUMNER WELLES RENEWS THE EVIDENCE ON VERSAILLES TREATY

Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State and long in the diplomatic service of this country, vividly describes in his recent book, *A Time for Decision*, how it gradually "became apparent that those gathered at Paris who had the power to shape the future world were departing more and more from the clear-cut principles of the Fourteen Points." Welles writes:

The arbiters of human destiny seemed less and less like prophets and more and more like harassed, tired, and irritable old men. The flood of emotional optimism quickly vanished in a wave of cold and cynical pessimism.

One of the chief reasons for the compromises which President Wilson felt himself obliged to accept at Paris was the fact that the United States had made no effort to reach a prior understanding with its allies concerning political and territorial problems. Nor, until the final months before the armistice, had this Government tried to come to an agreement with the Allies regarding the Covenant of the League of Nations. Wilson claimed that he was uninformed of the nature of the secret treaties, distributing vast territories and their inhabitants in a manner wholly inconsistent with the Fourteen Points.

FAILURE TO USE OUR BARGAINING POWER BRINGS SURRENDER OF PRINCIPLES OF FOURTEEN POINTS

Because the United States had failed to exact a commitment to specific, democratic peace terms from the European Allies when our bargaining power was prodigious, President Wilson was driven into surrendering principle after principle during the actual process of formulating the peace treaty at Versailles. The President mistakenly believed that a league of nations could subsequently right the injustices of the Versailles Treaty. But at least three of the President's appointees to the American Peace Commission were aware that this hope was built on quicksand. Five of the principal American experts were so alarmed at what was happening that they wrote letters protesting against the peace terms

and stating that they considered them an abandonment of the principles for which the Americans had fought.

Many tragic consequences followed President Wilson's absorption in securing a world organization at the expense of a just peace. One of these disastrous consequences which is full of meaning for us today was the cession of the Chinese province of Shantung to Japan. During and immediately after the First World War, Japan was classified among the righteous, peace-loving nations who were our associates in that war. The President desperately wanted all those nations, including Japan, in the League of Nations.

But Japan demanded a high, imperialistic price for her cooperation. On August 15, 1914, the Japanese Government had presented an ultimatum to the German Government demanding the entire territory known as Shantung, which the Germans had acquired from helpless China on a 99-year lease. The Japanese issued an ultimatum asserting that it wanted this territory with a view to the eventual restoration of the same to China. Japan then seized the territory, and in company with a small British contingent, took possession.

China rightly demanded the return of her territory at the peace table. Her right was undisputed in law and justice, but President Wilson apparently felt it was more important to get Japan into the League than it was to do justice to the Chinese. In spite of all the vigorous protests of China and of many of our own representatives at the peace conference, the then supposedly peace-loving Japan was appeased by the gift of Shantung.

GENERAL BLISS PROTESTS SURRENDER OF SHANTUNG TO JAPAN

Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, one of the five members appointed to the American Peace Commission by President Wilson, wrote a long memorandum to the President in which he reviewed the history of Japan's action in seizing the Shantung province and protested vigorously against taking it from China. In the course of this long memorandum to the President he said:

If it be right for a policeman, who recovers your purse, to keep the contents and claim that he has fulfilled his duty in returning the empty purse, then Japan's conduct may be tolerated. * * *

If we support Japan's claim, we abandon the democracy of China to the domination of the Prussianized militarism of Japan.

We shall be sowing dragons' teeth.

General Bliss thought it would be better to leave Japan out of the League than to buy her participation with the shameful concession of Shantung. A few days before the decision was reached he wrote his wife that he thought it was time to clear the air by drawing a line on one side of which the robbers should stand and on the other side honest men.

Another member of our Peace Commission, Secretary of State Robert Lansing, was in accord with General Bliss. In a memorandum made soon after Lansing became certain Shantung was to be given to Japan, he wrote:

It is a surrender of the principle of self-determination, a transfer of millions of Chinese from one foreign master to another. This is another of those secret arrangements which have riddled the Fourteen Points and are wrecking a just peace.

In my opinion it would be better to let Japan stay out of the League than to abandon China and surrender our prestige in the Far East for "a mess of pottage"—and a mess it is. I fear that it is too late to do anything to save the situation.

A third member of our Peace Commission, Henry White, who had long been in the diplomatic service, wrote to Mr. Lansing on November 8, 1919, saying that he feared the Shantung decision, besides being wrong in itself, would arouse serious opposition to the treaty in the United States.

Japan, a so-called peace-loving ally at that time, was appeased in order to bribe her into the League of Nations. All of us should ponder the meaning of that lesson today as we listen to the demand that we sacrifice the rights of helpless nations in order to entice a reluctant ally into joining the proposed international organization now under consideration at San Francisco.

The Versailles Treaty itself was shot through with injustice and war-breeding settlements. It was founded on revenge and not reconstruction, on imperialism and not democracy, on territorial aggrandizement and not self-determination, on trade grabbing and not equal opportunities for all nations.

JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES' JUDGMENT OF VERSAILLES TREATY

I want to read a brief judgment which was passed upon this war-breeding Treaty of Versailles by John Maynard Keynes, now Lord Keynes. Mr. Keynes was attached to the British Treasury in 1919 and served as the official Treasury representative at the Paris Peace Conference. This distinguished British economist said in his book, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, which had such a profound effect upon public opinion here and abroad:

The treaty includes no provisions for the economic rehabilitation of Europe—nothing to make the defeated central empires into good neighbors, nothing to stabilize the new states of Europe, nothing to reclaim Russia; nor does it provide in any way a compact or economic solidarity among the Allies themselves. * * *

The Council of Four paid no attention to these issues, being preoccupied with others. * * * It is an extraordinary fact that the fundamental economic problems of a Europe starving and disintegrating before their eyes, was the one question in which it was impossible to arouse the interest of the four. Reparation was their main excursion into the economic field, and they settled it as a problem of theology, of politics, of electoral chicanery, from every point of view except that of the economic future of the states whose destiny they were handling.

Mr. Keynes says of those who gathered at Paris to make the Treaty of Versailles:

The future life of Europe was not their concern; its means of livelihood was not their anxiety. Their preoccupations, good and bad alike, related to frontiers and nationalities, to the balance of power, to imperial aggrandizements, to the future enfeeblement of a strong and dangerous enemy, to revenge, and to the shifting by the victors of their un-

bearable financial burdens onto the shoulders of the defeated.

This was the kind of "peace" that the League of Nations was erected to enforce. The terms of the Versailles Treaty doomed the League from the beginning. This "so-called League to enforce a so-called peace" as the late President Roosevelt once contemptuously referred to it, sat perched in Geneva, shackled to an intolerable treaty in the midst of a continent seething with political unrest and economic upheaval. Some of its subsidiary organizations, dealing with problems of health, labor, and communications, did magnificent work, but the League as an organization to maintain an enduring peace was a failure from the beginning.

First. Because it was created to implement a peace settlement which contained within its own provisions the seeds of future war, and

Second. Because its dominating members were more concerned with imperialistic policies, balance of power, and selfish aggrandizement than in maintaining conditions of peace.

DOMINANT POWERS IN LEAGUE HAD NECESSARY MILITARY POWER TO CRUSH HITLER AND MUSSOLINI PRIOR TO 1936

A study of the history of the world between the World Wars must make it clear even to the most casual student that the powers dominating the League of Nations had it within their military capacity for the first 15 years of the life of the League to prevent conditions making for war. The power of France and Britain on the continent of Europe was absolute and unchallenged. When these diabolical movements in Germany and Italy were in their infancy, Britain and France needed no assistance so far as military measures were concerned to crush them. Up to the time that Adolf Hitler sent his brown-shirted gangsters to reoccupy the Rhineland in 1936, Britain and France alone, from a military standpoint, could have kept Germany disarmed and Mussolini impotent without levying a single additional dollar for armaments. But the record shows that for political reasons they tolerated and even helped to build up nazism in Germany and fascism in Italy.

The groups then in power in Britain and France actually aided in the growth and development of this brutalitarianism which was to plunge the world into the bloodiest war of all time. These same powers starved and humiliated the German Republic, which, had it been maintained and strengthened, might have been a stabilizing force in Europe. Thus they helped to provide Hitler with the ammunition he needed to wreck the Republic and substitute his own brutal regime.

It is a painful experience to review this grim record of the past. Personally it would be easier to ignore it. But to ignore the forces in Britain and France which helped to build up nazism and fascism in Germany and Italy would be a tragic mistake if we are to prevent now a betrayal of the aspirations of the people of our own country and the democratic minded peoples of all countries. The events of 1919 to 1929 have a powerful

lesson for us which should be studied and mastered by those who have the awful responsibility of charting the course for the world's tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. When the Senator uses the word "ammunition" in the statement which he has just made, he uses it both figuratively and literally, does he not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do. I am glad the Senator brought out that point, because as I use the word it has both connotations.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator's statement is a distinct contribution. I believe that we need to keep in mind the problems ahead. The record shows rather conclusively that after the last World War England and France actually sold most of the war machines to both Germany and Italy, just as the United States sold most of Japan's war machines to Japan.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the able Senator for his attention, and for his very illuminating comment.

WE HAVE NOT MASTERED LESSONS OF THE PAST

There is overwhelming evidence that up to the present we have not mastered these lessons of the past. Thus far we have been traveling a road which, almost step by step, parallels the tragic road we took after the First World War. Unless we change our direction soon, we shall find that our fantastic expenditure of men, money, and materials has bought us only a short and uneasy truce—not the enduring peace we pray for and seek.

The events of the past few years justify this conclusion. In the first place, we failed when we entered this war to exercise our enormous bargaining power. No less than in 1917-18 the Allied Powers have been desperately dependent upon the United States for men, money, munitions, food, and supplies. And yet, when our bargaining power was at its peak we did little toward publicly pledging them and ourselves to a democratic peace through open covenants openly arrived at. Apparently all we have achieved is the famous and now almost forgotten Atlantic Charter. For a time this aroused high hopes in this and in every other country where the democratic spirit prevailed. We were led to believe that it was a genuine covenant, even though it had been secretly arrived at. But later we were informed that this agreement, so widely publicized as a solemn, signed covenant, was only a news release scribbled on pieces of paper.

I should be as shocked as I know most Americans would be at any suggestion that we should have used or should now use our bargaining power to wrest concessions from our allies for the aggrandizement of our own Nation or the satisfaction of any selfish desires which may be in the minds of special interests in the United States. The commitments we should have secured and even now should strive to secure, for I do not believe our bargaining power is all gone, are those in behalf of freedom and democracy for small nations and subject

peoples. Such commitments are important to the United States in the sense that they are important to all nations and all peoples genuinely determined to create conditions for an enduring peace by getting at the causes of war.

WE HAVE FAILED TO USE OUR BARGAINING POWER IN WORLD WAR II

I think it must be perfectly clear that in this World War, as in the last, the United States has thus far failed to use its bargaining power effectively. I repeat that it has been more prodigious, and more effective in this war than in the last. It must be obvious to every American who has watched the developments from Casablanca, Quebec, Teheran, Dumbarton Oaks, and Yalta, that virtually every compromise which has been made on behalf of the American Government has been made at the expense of the very principles to which we have committed ourselves before the world.

I do not propose on this occasion to take up in any detail the record of compromise and surrender which has marked our relations with our principal allies. However, I do want to touch on a few of the developments with the utmost brevity. I should like to say at the outset that I have no doubt some of my words will be misinterpreted and distorted by the smear bund. It has become virtually impossible to criticize the activities of at least one of our allies—Soviet Russia—however constructively, without bringing down about one's head a storm of smearing vilification and misrepresentation by a tightly organized minority in the United States. The very tactics which Adolf Hitler embraced as his own in *Mein Kampf*—the big lie, the big smear, and the wholesale impugning of motives and character—have been taken over by this Russia-can-do-no-wrong chorus in the United States. The result is that many Americans who have sound, constructive criticism to offer are being intimidated into remaining silent. I feel deeply that great and irreparable injury is being done to the cause of world peace and to American-Russian relations by this minority group which demands cringing acquiescence to everything the Kremlin does. I refuse, so far as I am personally concerned, to go along with this Hitler-like doctrine of total approval and unquestioning obedience. This is totalitarian doctrine. It is un-American. It violates the basic concept of democracy. This doctrine violates the spirit of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. There was nothing in the oath of office I took under the Constitution of the United States which obligates me to say "Ja" to everything and anything my own Government does, and there is certainly no obligation to say "Ja" to everything and anything a foreign power may do. Such unquestioning acceptance of every tentative proposal made by a foreign power will ultimately wreck our cooperation with any country.

ENDURING RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA DEPEND ON FRANK DISCUSSION

I believe that any enduring cooperation with Soviet Russia, as with every other country, must be based upon genuine understanding and accord. Only by

frankly facing and openly discussing all important difficulties and major differences of policies as they arise can a true meeting of minds be reached. When understandings have been openly arrived at they should be formulated in open covenants so that the peoples of the countries involved may know what commitments have been made.

The past, which I have been reviewing here today, should teach us that secret treaties breed evil and bring war among nations. I remember the time when Russia was reminding the world of this fact and was demanding the repudiation of secret treaties and secret diplomacy. The present program of the Russian Government is a sharp deviation from the peace program she was proposing in the early days of her revolution. During the First World War, soon after the overthrow of the Czar, the Russian Revolutionary Government proposed to the Allies terms for peace, which, had they been agreed upon and incorporated into the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, could have made a much better treaty and a more effective League of Nations to prevent war.

One of the first acts of the Russian Revolutionary Government of 1917 was to open the archives of the Czarist regime. In those archives they discovered the sordid, war-breeding treaties that had been secretly made among the European Allied Governments. The provisional Russian Revolutionary Government publicly repudiated those treaties and issued a proclamation for a peace without annexations and indemnities, based upon the foundation of the self-determination of nations. Those were terms to which the democratic-minded peoples of the world could and did subscribe. They were in accord with the principles that President Wilson had proclaimed as the United States war aims.

The Russians sought to have the question of a public declaration of war aims and potential peace terms brought up before the Inter-Allied Conference which was to meet in Paris on November 29, 1917. Col. Edward M. House, who had been appointed by the President as the leading American representative, arrived in London 3 weeks before the Paris Conference. At two intimate dinners he had confidential talks about war aims and peace terms with Lord Chief Justice Reading and the Prime Minister, Lloyd George. After those talks he recorded in his diary that he thought it would be useless to try to get either the British or the French to designate terms and noted that neither Great Britain nor France could meet the new Russian terms of "no indemnities and no aggression." A little later, on the same day that the British Cabinet had discussed among other things the question of Rumania and Russia—Does that strike a responsive chord at the moment?—Colonel House dropped in at No. 10 Downing Street. There he, Mr. Balfour, and the Prime Minister, Lloyd George, conferred for an hour and a half, again going into the question of war aims. Maps were brought out and Mr. Balfour started in on his ideas of territorial division. Mr. House decided

it was worse than useless to discuss territorial aims then, and that what was needed was an announcement of general war aims and the formation of an international association to prevent future wars. When the Inter-Allied Conference met in Paris, war aims and the Russian question were skillfully ignored.

The Bolsheviks had come into power under Lenin the day before Colonel House arrived in London. They went even further than the Russian provisional government had gone. On November 17, 1917, they actually published in Russia the texts of these secret Allied treaties which proved that the Allied Governments had been sending soldiers to the front to die, not for democracy but for territorial aggrandizement. News of the publication of these treaties spread rapidly to other countries, although many conservative newspapers tried to ignore them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to make a statement rather than to ask a question, but I will take only a moment or two.

I have heard the eloquent and able argument of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], for whom I have a great admiration. I was very sorry to hear him make such a vicious—it seemed to me—attack upon our late President Wilson and upon the League of Nations which he had proposed. I do not wish to argue the matter now, but at a later date I shall undertake to state some of the facts as I knew them.

Mr. President, I was a Member of the Senate during the entire time the treaty of peace and the League of Nations were under consideration. As I have said, I was a Member of the Senate at the time, and took a very active part in behalf of the League of Nations. I was a very earnest supporter and ardent friend of the late Woodrow Wilson. It has been my good fortune to have known personally nine Presidents of the United States. The first one whom I knew was Mr. McKinley, and the next one was Theodore Roosevelt. I had a very intimate personal acquaintance and friendship with Hon. William H. Taft, who was President of the United States for 4 years. I knew Mr. Wilson, I knew Mr. Harding, I knew Mr. Coolidge, I knew Mr. Hoover, I knew Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and also our present President, Mr. Truman.

I wish to say for Mr. Wilson that he was the most earnest, most vigorous, most active, most determined, and most unselfish advocate of peace of whom I have ever known. He was one of the ablest and most learned of men. He was one of the most ardent and intense lovers of peace whom this or any other nation has ever produced. He took the first great step in an attempt to obtain a lasting peace in the world. He was the vigorous, active, and determined fore-runner in an effort to secure the peace of the world and, in my judgment, if the Senate of the United States had ratified the League of Nations which President

Wilson had proposed, we would never have had a Second World War.

I believe that statement so thoroughly and so intensely that I could not leave the Chamber without first asking my distinguished friend, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], to permit me to make the statement which I have now made, and to say to him that on a later occasion I shall reexamine the splendid speech and argument which he has delivered, and endeavor, if I may do so, to correct some of the inaccuracies made by him with reference to the League of Nations, and especially to the part which our then great President took in attempting to secure a lasting peace for the world.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I was delighted to yield to the able Senator from Tennessee, as I am always delighted to yield to any other Senator. However, if the Senator from Tennessee will examine my remarks he will not find the slightest justification for his statement that I have attacked President Wilson, or questioned his sincerity so far as his actions were concerned.

Mr. President, I was likewise here—though not as a Member of the Senate—and was on and off the floor during the entire time the League of Nations was under discussion in the Senate. I was in Washington during the time immediately before our participation in the First World War, and thereafter. I devoted a great deal of time during that period to a study of available contemporary material. Since then I have devoted a great deal of time to the material which has become available in the memoirs and in the memoranda to which I have referred.

The point which I am seeking to make is that we have an obligation to profit by the mistakes in judgment which have been made in the past. The main thesis of my argument is that a treaty which is not grounded upon justice cannot be enforced by any organization over any considerable period of time. I have quoted from the comments, memoirs, and source data to show what happened at Paris and Versailles. This material is quoted from distinguished and honorable men who were members of the peace commission of the United States, or who were present in other official capacities. I have relied on their comments which they made at the time, solely to show that there were men present at the peace conference who believed that things were then being done in such a way that no League of Nations, no matter how well devised, could bear up under the task of trying to enforce the treaty which was written, not upon the basis of President Wilson's war aims, and not upon his efforts which he put forth at Versailles and Paris, but mainly upon the basis of secret treaties for aggrandizement, territorial acquisition, and imperialism, which our associates and allies of the First World War had entered into even before we had become participants in the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I recommend to the Senator from Tennes-

see that he read—if he has time to read—especially one of the sources from which I have taken a great deal of my material. I urge him to read Stephen Bonsal's *Unfinished Business*. Colonel Bonsal was the personal interpreter for Colonel House, and for President Wilson after he arrived in Paris. His book to which I have referred, and which has just won the Pulitzer prize, sets forth contemporary notes and memoranda which he made on the spot.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator, in view of what he has said, that I thought so much of the League of Nations and its advocacy at that time by President Wilson that I supported him very heartily. I hope that the International Conference at San Francisco in preparing the forthcoming treaty will do as well as was done by President Wilson after the First World War. I know that we ought to enter into a lasting treaty of peace. If I understand the San Francisco Conference it is very closely following the proposals for a lasting peace inaugurated by President Wilson after the First World War, and I pray God that the Conference may frame and adopt as good a proposal for a lasting peace as was had after the first war. I was for the one then advanced, and I am strongly for the proposed one now, and I sincerely hope and trust that my distinguished and able friend from Wisconsin will join me in the effort to secure lasting peace for the world, which of course must be based on the first treaty submitted by President Wilson.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, my comments on the Senator's last remarks are, first, that the Conference at San Francisco is not working on anything which has the slightest relation to the determination of the peace settlements. All that is being done at San Francisco is work upon the Dumbarton Oaks-Yalta proposals, which are predicated upon compromise in order to bring about an agreement among the great powers for an organization which will be called upon to attempt to enforce and to maintain the peace settlements as they have been made or will be made when the war is over.

Secondly, Mr. President, the entire burden of my argument is to point out, without personal reflection upon any person who took part in the peace settlement following the First World War, that we must learn the lesson of their mistakes if we are to save oncoming generations in this and other countries from another and more awful blood lesson. The lesson is that the best organization which can be devised at San Francisco or any other place based on a bad peace will be as ineffective when the test comes as was the League of Nations. We must write a peace which is rooted in the principles of justice if an international organization is to succeed in its enforcement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree with that entirely, and I think we will have, as we had before, a proposal rooted in terms of justice, because justice to all nations lies at the bottom of any attempt to make a lasting peace.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the course of my remarks I shall point out temporary settlements which have already been made, and which I fear will be permanent, which I think violate every tenet of justice and democracy and the announced war aims of the United States in this war.

Now, Mr. President, to return to this historical review for a few moments.

Translations of the secret treaties were published in the Manchester Guardian on December 2, 1917, and they appeared in pamphlet form in England a little later. The treaties were published in this country in the New York Evening Post on January 25, 26, and 28, 1918, and also appeared here in pamphlet form.

Exposure of these sordid bargains brought desertions among soldiers in the European armies, protests from trade unionists in England, and from labor members in the House of Commons. The disaffection was so great among the democratic-minded people in Europe that the Allied Governments became alarmed. In order to allay suspicion as to Britain's imperialistic aims and to win the support of labor, Prime Minister Lloyd George made a war-aims speech before the Trade Union Congress in London on January 5, 1918, professing adherence to general principles previously announced by President Wilson. To allay unrest among the French people, Premier Clemenceau promptly endorsed Lloyd George's statement.

On January 8, 1918, President Wilson appeared before Congress and delivered his Fourteen Points speech, which renewed the hopes of many peoples in different countries who longed for the kind of a peace that might endure.

In the course of that speech, President Wilson said:

There is * * * a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people.

It was true that the voice of the Russian people had been more compelling and moving than any other at the time when it repudiated and exposed the sordid secret treaties and called for a declaration of terms upon which there was a possibility of building an enduring peace.

I shall never forget the thrill of that Russian voice repudiating sordid secret international bargains and calling for a new kind of open diplomacy and open international agreements.

I advocated recognition of the Russian Soviets and urged economic cooperation with that Government. I did this at a time when many present fanatical Russophiles in this and other countries were advocating policies that sought to destroy that government.

No doubt the failure of the capitalistic governments to respond to her earlier call has perhaps made Russia suspicious. Certainly Russia's international policy has changed radically since 1917. Her present demands and her methods seem more in accord with the old imperialistic purposes and methods of the

czarist regime than with those of the early days of her revolution.

Russia may be at present as suspicious of the capitalistic countries as we are of her intention to try to force communism upon other countries. Unless these mutual suspicions between these two great countries can be eradicated by frank and honest discussion, it will be impossible to create and maintain an effective and genuinely cooperative world organization.

I am well aware of the stupendous contribution our Russian ally has made to victory in Europe. I yield to no man in my admiration for the magnificent courage and heroic sacrifices of the Russian people. I yield to no man in my admiration for the magnificent courage and resolution of the Russian people in standing up against the brutal invader, driving the Nazi hordes from their homeland, and pressing on to final victory.

RUSSIA'S ACTIVITIES IN WORLD POLITICS ENDANGER HOPES FOR LASTING PEACE

Recently I have watched Soviet Russia's activities in the field of world politics with grave apprehension. On this occasion I do not criticize her internal economy nor her conduct of domestic affairs, although I disagree completely with her totalitarian form of government. But I am deeply concerned about her policies in world affairs, for here her conduct has a direct and perhaps decisive impact on all our hopes for a just and enduring peace.

Russia's policies in Europe have constituted a direct violation of the pledges of the Atlantic Charter, to which she subscribed. Her arbitrary policies toward Poland constitute clear-cut violations of the United Nations' pledges against territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Russia's insistence on establishing the Made-in-Moscow Lublin regime as the Government of Poland not only violates the Atlantic Charter, but is clearly a violation of the terms of the Yalta agreement to which Marshal Stalin subscribed when he met with the late President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill. I have been shocked at the failure of most of our American newspapers to challenge these undemocratic and war-provoking demands and actions of our Russian ally. The feeble response of what was once our liberal press has been especially alarming to me.

Russia has also violated the Atlantic Charter and Yalta agreements in other areas liberated from the Nazi yoke: in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Austria. In these countries American and British officials have been denied an opportunity to freely examine conditions at first hand. These areas have been blacked out so far as the press of this country and Great Britain are concerned.

The Kremlin has taken over these territories in much the same way and with much the same methods that it would the states within the actual prewar boundaries of Soviet Russia. In some of these areas there is double talk about elections in the future. But plebiscites held after purges, liquidations, and deportations of liberal and democratic

forces are a hollow mockery of the very tenets of democracy as practiced in the world prior to the advent of totalitarianism.

THE YALTA AGREEMENT VIOLATED

I was not one of those who gave way to unbounded enthusiasm when the results of the Yalta Conference of the Big Three were announced with the publication of the Crimea declaration. I publicly stated that the proof of the pudding would be in the eating thereof.

My reservations on the agreement were based among others on two main propositions.

First. The way in which the Communists twist the meaning of words from their common usage in the truly democratic countries makes it very difficult to reach an understanding with them on the one hand and gives their propaganda a tremendous advantage on the other.

Second. I do not now and I never have believed that the end justifies the means.

I hoped, however, that the agreement might serve to lessen the tensions and afford an opportunity for joint consultations on some of the more perplexing problems of Europe. This hope has dwindled as the Soviet Union has failed again and again to live up to the terms of the agreement as it was made public.

The agreement to which Marshal Stalin, Prime Minister Churchill, and the late President Roosevelt subscribed at Yalta contained a declaration on liberated Europe. In addressing the Congress of the United States shortly after his return, Mr. Roosevelt placed extraordinary emphasis on that phase of the Crimea agreement because he felt so strongly and hoped so much apparently that it would permit of a just and democratic settlement of some of the more compelling issues of Europe. That declaration on liberated Europe specifically committed the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union to the following:

They jointly declare their mutual agreement to concert, during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe, the policies of their three Governments in assisting the peoples liberated * * * to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems. * * * The three Governments will jointly assist the people * * * to form interim governmental authorities, broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people.

This agreement has been consistently flouted by the Soviet Union, which has proceeded unilaterally, and without in any way consulting her two partners, namely, the United States and Great Britain, to set up in country after country governments which are made in Moscow, and do not fulfill any of the basic requirements agreed to at Yalta.

LATEST EXAMPLE IS AUSTRIA

The latest example is Austria, where the Kremlin created a provisional government, placed it in power, and announced it to the world without in any way consulting Great Britain and the United States. This was only a dreary repetition of developments in Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Poland. The details are different in each

instance. But the fundamental fact is always the same—Russia ignores her solemn commitments made at Yalta to a program of joint responsibility and cooperation in establishing temporary regimes for the liberated lands of Europe.

Mr. President, I have two maps here which I had hoped to have enlarged so that I could hang them on the wall of the Senate, but I shall be glad to have any Senator who cares to do so look at them.

One of these maps shows the boundaries of Russia on the first of September, 1939. The second map shows the boundaries of Russia as of June 1, 1945. The areas on the 1945 map with the black around them are the territories which Russia has actually taken over and absorbed into the Soviet Union since the war started. The areas in pink are the areas where, although the details may be different, governments have been established or military controls have been set up where whatever policy is laid down in Moscow is adhered to by the government in those respective territories. It does not show, because it is so small, the island of Bornholm in the Baltic Sea—a strategically important island which Russia has taken over—as described by a correspondent of the New York Times who apparently got there by "mistake."

My only purpose in exhibiting these maps is to give any Senators interested an idea of the factual territorial results of the war to date, so far as Russia is concerned.

I have secured what I believe to be reliable information concerning what has taken place in Rumania and Bulgaria. Of course, this is not first-hand testimony, so far as I am concerned, because, in the first place, I have had no opportunity to go to these areas, and, if I did have the opportunity and sought to go there, I have no doubt I would be denied access to them. But I shall ask to have this information concerning Rumania and Bulgaria printed because I think it is important that we should assemble the best available information. If any of the facts therein contained are untrue, the responsibility rests with the Soviet Government and with the governments in these areas which are satellites, or are operating as subsidiaries of the main mother corporation, for not permitting the representatives of the press and not even permitting representatives of our armed forces to have full and free access to these territories.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statements respecting Rumania and Bulgaria printed as exhibits at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits B and C.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin suffer an interruption by the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With respect to the map exhibited by the Senator from Wisconsin showing the situation as of

June 1, 1945, I ask the Senator whether it differs substantially from the map as it existed in 1914 before the last war?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh I think it certainly does, because if the Senator will examine it with a little care he will see that it takes in part of Germany, it takes in Rumania and Yugoslavia—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I mean the territory embraced within the black line, which the Senator says is incorporated into Russia, that is, actually within Russia. My first question is: It is practically the same, is it not; that is, it is no larger, substantially, than Russia was in 1914 before World War I?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not have the 1914 Russian boundary lines on the map for comparison, but I would say generally speaking that the Senator from Arkansas is correct. I would not want to have to stand examination by a cartographer, however, on that point because I do not have the exact 1914 lines on the map.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But substantially the territory is the same, including the buffer states?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The buffer states which were carved out in the Versailles Treaty did belong to Russia prior to 1914.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, it is a fair statement to say that Russia's boundaries today approximate what her boundaries were in 1914, when we consider what she has incorporated into Russia now, is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator confines himself solely to the territory actually within Soviet Russia at the present time I think that he is substantially correct, but I would not want to vouch for it, because I do not have that line on the map.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to ask the further question respecting the other satellite states. In the first instance, they are still under military control of the Russians, is that not correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They are supposed to be under the control of an allied commission, as I understand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say they are actually under the military control of the Russians?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to read to the Senator the information I have respecting Rumania, to show the Senator exactly what has taken place from the best information I am able to get under the circumstances.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not disagree with the Senator respecting the fact that they have not concerted as they should have under the Yalta agreement. I agree that they are justly open to criticism in that respect. But to go further and assume at this point that they intend to incorporate these other satellite states into Russia I do not believe is justified.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not say that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator did not mean to say that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not say that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I say that as to these governments the countries of which are represented in pink, although

they are of various types and kinds, and the situations vary with respect to them, it is my firm conviction from all the information I am able to obtain under difficult circumstances, because of the black-out in these areas created and maintained by Russia—but from all the information I can obtain those governments respond to the policies of the Kremlin.

Let me read what I have here respecting Rumania. I will not take the time to read what I have concerning Bulgaria, but since the Senator from Arkansas is interested, I should like to read what I have concerning Rumania. This is not my first-hand testimony. I have not been there, and I could not get there, I feel sure, if I tried, any more than any American newspaperman can get there, any more than any Allied officers representing Great Britain and the United States have any freedom of action there. These facts I believe are correct, and they come from the best source of information I could obtain. I read:

Rumania occupied a special place in Russia's plans. Since the beginning of the Russo-German war Rumania had been Germany's ally. Rumania provided Germany with troops, and was useful economically and politically. Germany got one-third of her oil from Rumania, and nearly half the mica she needed; also cotton, wool, and other essential materials.

In addition Rumania was a monument of the supposed Axis solidarity in the Balkans.

Rumania was Germany's unwilling ally. Rumania had been the friend of Poland and France, and counted for her safety on German-Russian antagonism. When Poland collapsed, divided between the Germans and the Russians, Rumania was helpless. Between Germans and Russians Rumania promptly lost a quarter of her territory and about 7,000,000 people. She had left an area twice the size of New York State and 12,000,000 subjects—twice the population of New York City.

After the Russians had defeated the Axis at Stalingrad, swept the Germans out of the Ukraine, recaptured Odessa, and forced evacuation of the Crimea, they regrouped for the assault on Rumania. Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov then broadcast the following statement:

"The Soviet Government has no intention to acquire any part of Rumanian territory or to change the existing social structure in Rumania or to infringe in any way upon the independence of Rumania. On the contrary, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to establish, together with the Rumanian people, the independence of Rumania by freeing Rumania from the Fascist yoke."

Russia's propaganda attack was successful. King Michael believed this statement and personally engineered a coup d'etat. He announced on August 23 last that he had accepted surrender to the Russians. The next day Rumania declared war on Germany.

Russian troops swept through Rumania. Rumanian leaders were arrested. Oil depots were captured. Vehicles were requisitioned. Communications and customs were taken in hand. Propaganda was placed under Russian control, newspapers were curtailed. Radios were confiscated. An American mission attempting to take pictures of the damage our bombers had done at Ploesti (the oil field there) was forced by the Russians to discontinue its investigations.

The Russians forced upon Rumania armistice terms which called for drastic reductions in the Rumanian Army, which was to come under Russian command and fight against Germany and Hungary. They called

for war trials and an indemnity of \$300,000,000 over the next 6 years, tantamount to turning over to Russia all of Rumania's exports and imports for a period of 4 years.

Russian military control dominated the Rumanian scene, and Rumania was isolated from the Anglo-Saxon world. The Russians then forced out the cabinet in power. In an extraordinary act of dictatorship, Vyshinski gave the Rumanian king just an hour and five minutes in which to appoint a new cabinet in which Communists would have the controlling positions—this despite the fact that the Communists number no more than 15 percent of Rumania's population.

Whole factories have been removed to Russia. Equipment belonging to American companies has been taken away—and our protests ignored. Arrests have been common. Some 80,000 persons have been forcibly shipped out of Rumania to labor for the Russians in Russia. A tight censorship has been imposed.

Sweeping changes were made in the Rumanian army and the army itself not permitted to return to Rumania from Czechoslovakia, where it was forced to fight under most unfavorable circumstances.

The demands for reparations have been increased to the point where Rumania's economy is all but ruined. Since August of a year ago the cost of living has gone up 429 percent. Bank notes in circulation have increased nearly 100 percent. All agricultural equipment has been taken over by the state. Small businesses and stores have been bankrupted.

Rumania's middle class has been deliberately ruined and there is no doubt but that the country is being sovietized. It will not be long before Rumania is just another state of the Soviet Union.

It is true that there is a so-called Allied Control Commission in Rumania, supposedly to see that the terms of the armistice are carried out. But the chairman of this commission is a Russian general and his British and American counterparts have nothing to say about the acts of the Commission. Nothing at all. At times the American and British generals do not know what has been done in their names until they hear about it from agonized Rumanians. At this very moment the movement of British and American officers is severely restricted—and we are supposed to be Russia's allies.

In view of Molotov's promise that Russia has no intention of changing the existing social structure in Rumania or infringing in any way upon the independence of Rumania, in view of the agreements made at Yalta, what is the thoughtful American to think—that American who earnestly believes we were fighting to bring freedom to an enslaved world?

Here is what the American and British Governments think: On March 15 the United States and Great Britain formally asked the Soviet Union for an explanation of its actions in Rumania, actions clearly contrary to agreement freely reached, actions clearly contrary to American hopes and ideals, actions which contain the seeds of still another world war. If any answer has been made by the Soviet Union to date, it has not yet been made public.

THESE DEVELOPMENTS ARE A CAUSE FOR DEEP CONCERN TO THOSE WHO WANT A LASTING PEACE

I am deeply concerned about these developments, and many others like them, because I believe their continuance will undermine, impair, and may destroy a program of genuine international cooperation. I cannot underwrite gross violations of the democratic principles which can alone provide a political climate for enduring peace. Nor can I have the slightest faith in a system of international cooperation which rests on the threats of any one nation to withdraw

unless she has her way in all matters where she feels she has a direct, selfish interest.

It seems to me all the more important, in view of Russia's great sacrifices toward winning the war, that we stand firmly against any steps which may wreck the peace. It is my earnest conviction that Russia is today making the same mistakes which France made after World War I. For all their lip service to the principles of genuine international cooperation, the French governments of the 1920's placed their faith in a network of military alliances, a ring of satellite states, and the Maginot line. In the end she found herself weakened, betrayed, and impotent. The whole artificial structure crashed like a house of cards before the first breath of reality. Russia will never find peace and security through dominating the Balkans, Central Europe, and the eastern Mediterranean. The history of France and of all these unhappy European countries proves that no lasting peace can be secured by imposing domination from the outside and from the top. An enduring peace can be built only by eliminating the deep underlying causes of these ever-recurring European conflicts.

CONCERN INCLUDES OUR OWN AND BRITISH POLICIES

My deep concern as to forces which are at present actually undermining our hope of international cooperation and the formation of an effective world organization for enduring peace are not confined to our Russian ally. My concern includes the conduct of our own Government in past years and certain activities of our British ally as well. I have already discussed some phases of our own Government's conduct.

No one who studies the causes of war can evade the basic fact that imperialism creates breeding grounds for conflict. I am convinced that Mr. Churchill's dogmatic, and at times arrogant, refusal to discuss any definite plans for freedom for the subject peoples of the British Empire deserves the greatest censure if we are seeking a lasting peace. I am no more prepared to commit the United States to enforcing British rule over India, Burma, or Malta than I am to commit my country to enforcing Russian dominion over Poland, Rumania, Austria, the Balkans, or any nations in the Baltic States.

Britain's curious operations in Italy and Greece—together with Mr. Churchill's affirmations of friendship for the Fascist government of Spain—are deeply disturbing to countless Americans who have accepted the doctrine that this is a war of liberation and freedom. We have come to the place in history when there must be plain thinking and decisive action to get at the basic causes of unrest, insecurity, and war. We shall be false to everything we think we have been fighting for if we do not speak up to our allies now and make it clear that although we are firmly resolved to participate actively in world affairs and meet to the full our responsibilities, we are equally determined that the power and influence of the United States shall never be lent to policing unjust peace terms and perpetuating an unjust status quo.

I have briefly reviewed this record of the recent past because I think an awareness of what has been going on is vital to any honest consideration of the Dumbarton Oaks plan, as amended at Yalta, which is now before the United Nations at San Francisco. Our hope for enduring peace rests, of course, on the nature of the peace settlement itself and on the nature of the organization created to preserve that settlement. The two, it seems to me, must be considered and must go together. It is because I feel so deeply that thus far the first arrangements of the peace settlement itself, some of which I have just referred to, are fraught with the gravest danger that I want now to discuss for a moment or two the nature of the organization to preserve those arrangements.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he goes to a different subject?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator was speaking about Poland. He stated that we must speak up. We have spoken up, and Russia does not seem inclined to agree with our interpretation of the Yalta agreement. What does the Senator propose to do about it? Would he go so far as to say that we would not participate in the organization or that we would fight Russia?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No. The Senator is now asking me to go into something which would take quite a while, and I do not wish to do that. At the same time I am not sure that I can make myself clear briefly. However, let me say that I believe that from the beginning our conduct has been too much predicated on the theory that it was essential to get Russia into this organization, and that the concessions which have been made at the conferences, and especially at Yalta—so far as we know them—were a mistake. They were not necessary. It was for that reason that I went into the history of the cession of Shantung from China to Japan at the end of the last war, in order to get Japan into the League of Nations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that it is not essential to have Russia in this organization?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think it is very essential to have her in; but my point is that if in trying to make this organization universal we pay too high a price in the form of imperialistic settlements, transfers of peoples, and populations against their will, we shall be repeating the same mistakes which occurred at Versailles and Paris, and history proves they are bound in the end to have the same consequences.

I am as anxious as is any man to have Russia in this organization, and I think she will come in; but I think that up to and through Yalta there has been too much of an attitude of believing that we had to pay a price to get her in and that we voluntarily offered too big a price. I am not at all convinced that it was necessary.

As I have said, I have opened my flank, because I had made a brief statement about a complex idea. Perhaps I should have avoided doing so at this time, until

I could make my statement complete and clear. But that is the reason why I have trespassed on the time of the Senate long enough to make this historical statement complete, because I think we must consider the historical background if we are to avoid the horrible consequences of past mistakes and if we are to secure an organization for international cooperation and to enforce the peace—a just peace—which the organization will be able to enforce.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask one more question, if the Senator will further yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that Russia's position with regard to Poland is similar to ours with regard to Panama or some of our other near neighbors, namely, that she has a little different interest than we have?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator asked the question. I wish to make it clear that I am not arguing about boundaries; but I am saying in regard to what has happened since Yalta, in Poland, so far as the Government is concerned, that if the Senator can find anything to square that with the Yalta agreement, I will eat the agreement in public. [Laughter.]

I say that is more important, because we have made these statements of idealistic objectives. We proclaimed the Atlantic Charter. We proclaimed the United Nations' declaration. Bear in mind that there is a continuous thread upon which the history of the emotional life of this nation is strung, and that is its understanding, appreciation of, and sympathy for the aspirations of people everywhere for the same kinds of freedom that we have here. When we announced the Fourteen Points, as was done in the last war, when we got the apparent acquiescence of our allies in that war, and then when the Allies turned around at Versailles and violated those principles and violated those pledges, the American people were shocked and disillusioned. We cannot do that again and expect to have the support of the American people for the kind of continuous international cooperation of a deep-going character which is essential if we are to have peace in the world.

So I have gone into this subject with that thought solely in mind, and I am sure that if the Senator examines my remarks he will find that I have said nothing which impugns the motives of the then President of the United States. I repeat, as I said to the Senator from Tennessee, that I have tried to set out all the difficulties he faced, and I have simply given a factual, historical recital of what happened. I have done that without intending to reflect upon the integrity, the character, or the intentions of any of the participants, any more than I am intending to reflect upon any of those of the persons who have been participants in any of the secret agreements and arrangements which have accompanied our participation in this war. But I do wish to point out, with all the emphasis at my command, the dangers which are involved in re-

peating those mistakes during and after this war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more—and then I will be through?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has said a good deal about secret agreements, and he has said that we are not living up to the Atlantic Charter. I should like to remind him that our own Constitution was formed in secret and really without the authority of the delegates, and furthermore our Declaration of Independence has stated some precepts to which all of us aspire, but which I think few Members of the Senate would agree have been fully carried out. Even now, after all these years, we have the effort before us to enact permanent FEPC legislation and to achieve the perfect freedom which we have set up as our objective. But a statement that because an agreement is secret it is necessarily bad is not supported by our experience, nor it the fact that we have not immediately or overnight achieved observance of all the principles of the Declaration of Independence a condemnation of the Atlantic Charter. The process is a gradual one.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I know that line of argument. I say again that I am not a perfectionist. All I am seeking is an organization that is practical enough to do the job, one which is not going to be rooted in peace sentiments so unjust that no organization, however cleverly contrived, can enforce it. It is my firm conviction that agreements which are entered into in secret lead to misunderstandings and double interpretations. Furthermore in a democracy, its leaders must take the people into their confidence, at least, far enough so that the people understand what is being done. Thus the people can have an opportunity intelligently to hammer out on the anvil of public debate and discussion their final judgments. This process is essential to the functioning of a democratic republic.

DUMBARTON OAKS

The United Nations Organization blueprint at Dumbarton Oaks represents, I know, a sincere attempt by men and nations of divergent viewpoints to fashion an instrument which would be acceptable to all. Nevertheless, it seems entirely clear that they stopped far short of an acceptable goal—and I am not talking of the perfect goal.

I am not and never have been a perfectionist. Most of my life has been spent in trying to get practical improvements adopted into the structure of our economic, political, and social life through group action.

For years I have served on committees and worked in this legislative body. In their practical operations there is little difference between national and international organizations, except that the problems are more complex, interests are more conflicting, and a meeting of minds more difficult to obtain.

I am offering constructive criticisms of the proposed world organization because I do not believe that, in its present form, it is sufficiently practical. All I am asking, Mr. President, is that it be

made practical enough to work. Let me make it clear that I do not hope for a perfect plan because I know full well from long public service that only time and experience can make the devices of men even reach in the direction of perfection. But I want an organization that is practical enough to make a constructive beginning in maintaining a just and democratic peace.

In its present form there are certain provisions which I fear may defeat that purpose.

I hope even at this late date that the delegates to the United Nations Conference will not be stampeded into accepting the judgment of the Big Three or the Big Four as conclusive, but will redouble their efforts to draft a charter which will strengthen the hope for genuine international cooperation by removing at least some of the more flagrant weaknesses of the original plan as amended at Yalta.

I pause here long enough to say, Mr. President, that one of the things which has disturbed me in the dispatches which I have been reading lately from San Francisco is the fact that the delegates at San Francisco seem to be in such a hurry. They keep setting up a dead line a week or 10 days ahead, and then they seem to put the pressure on everyone to compromise or to stop any further discussion in order to get the job finished by a certain date.

I hope that delegates to San Francisco will be guided by the wisdom of the founding fathers who sweat it out for months in Philadelphia and took recesses and adjournments when it was necessary in order to get the document upon which they were working into the best possible form.

I am not making a plea for delay for one moment beyond the time those who are working on the charter are convinced they have accomplished all that can be accomplished. It is a plea that they will not, in their haste, arrive at unworkable compromises, or at unworkable solutions of the many complex and difficult problems which they have under consideration. As I have said before, the organization which is in formation at San Francisco will have no functions to perform immediately after it shall have been completed at San Francisco. It must first be ratified by the several governments who become members of it. I assume that it must await the final peace settlements before it can go into operation, so far as areas which have been ravished by war are concerned.

So I hope and pray, Mr. President, that the delegates at San Francisco will stop trying to meet deadlines which have no relation to reality, and take whatever time shall be necessary in order to do the best that human beings, with intentions of serving their fellow men, can do.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I hope that even at this late date the delegates to the United Nations Conference will not be stampeded into accepting as conclusive the judgment of the Big Three or the Big Four. I do not believe that the Big Three or the Big Four, any more than any big three Senators or any big

four Senators, have all the wisdom in the world. I believe that others may have something to contribute to a solution of the difficult problems which lie ahead. I hope our delegates at San Francisco will redouble their efforts to draft a charter which will strengthen hope for continuous international cooperation, by removing at least some of the more flagrant weaknesses of the original plan as amended at Yalta.

The fundamental need is for a far more democratic organization—one that will be responsive to the peoples of the world rather than to the power politics demands of a few dominating powers. In its present form, the Dumbarton Oaks plan strikes me as a gilded facade for the old-style military alliance built exclusively on force or the threat of force. In other words, it is the type of alliance which great European powers have employed all through history without ever preventing a war.

ALLIANCES IN THE PAST BASED ON BIG POWER DOMINATION HAVE FAILED

History is filled with grim reminders that alliances based upon the theory that a clique of victorious powers should dominate the world and police the peace lead only to repression, imperialism, and ultimately war. The Quadruple Alliance of the nineteenth century is a classic example. The four great powers which overthrew Napoleon, such as Great Britain, Prussia, Russia, and Austria, banded together to preserve the fruits of their victory. They, too, embellished their more earthly ambitions with fine-spun phrases. Article 6 of the treaty establishing the Quadruple Alliance in November 1815, read:

In order to consolidate the connections which at the present moment so closely unite the four sovereigns, the high contracting parties have agreed to renew at fixed intervals, either under their own auspices or by their representative ministers, meetings consecrated to great common objects and the examination of such measures as at each one of these epochs shall be judged most salutary for the peace and prosperity of all nations, and for the maintenance of the peace of Europe.

Compare this language, as the enterprising news letter Human Events did, with the comparable sentences in the Crimea Declaration of 1945 at Yalta:

The Premier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the President of the United States of America have consulted each other in the common interests of the people of their countries and those of liberated Europe. . . . The Conference agreed that permanent machinery should be set up for regular consultation between the three foreign secretaries.

History records the unhappy result of the quadruple alliance of 1815. Britain soon withdrew, for, as her Foreign Secretary, George Canning, put it bluntly:

What is the influence we have had in the counsels of the alliance? We protested at Ljubach, we remonstrated at Verona. Our protest was treated as wastepaper; our remonstrances mingled with the air.

The big power alliance of more than a century ago inevitably became a harsh instrument of repression and reaction which sought to snuff out the aspirations

of small countries and liberal forces, and generally to maintain an intolerable status quo. The whole arrangement exploded in 1848 with the revolutions and wars which swept the Continent for years afterward.

The proposed world organization emerging at San Francisco is a far cry from the true conception of collective security advocated by many sincere exponents of internationalism. For the sake of the argument, let us waive the question of whether collective security can succeed when all nations retain their complete sovereignty and consider the veto power which permits any one of the five great powers—Britain, Russia, the United States, France, or China—to veto a charge of aggression against itself. Under this provision any one of these nations which might be accused of aggression or of a warlike act would be allowed to sit upon the jury, so to speak, which passes upon its own acts. Then, as a member of that jury, the accused nation can, by its own single vote, declare itself "not guilty." Mark this: Thereupon the world organization would be confronted with the horrible choice of either permitting the aggression to go on or of acting in violation of their own pledges and entering upon a war to stop the aggression.

APPLY DUMBARTON OAKS TO THE PAST

Suppose a plan similar to Dumbarton Oaks had been in operation after the First World War. In 1919 Japan was considered a "peace-loving nation" and would have therefore been entitled to a seat as a permanent member of the security council. Twelve years later the security council would have been confronted with a crisis when Japan moved into Manchuria in 1931. This was a definite act of aggression by any definition. Suppose China had then taken action and accused Japan of aggression. The security council would have met in solemn assembly, listened to all of the arguments, decided that Japan was an aggressor, and moved that economic or military sanctions be imposed upon Japan.

But then, according to the Dumbarton Oaks voting scheme, the Japanese delegate to the security council would have been invited into the jury box to vote upon the motion with the other 10 members of the Security Council. The roll would have been called, and the other 10 members would have voted "guilty" upon the evidence submitted. But the Japanese delegate could have voted "not guilty." By a single vote, as against the 10 other votes, Japan would have won the verdict. This seems preposterous when applied to this shocking instance of aggression in the recent past. Yet that is precisely what the Dumbarton Oaks plan, as now decided upon at San Francisco, clearly permits.

The Washington Post, which is strongly supporting a world organization to enforce peace, on May 19, 1945, published an editorial telegraphed from San Francisco commenting on this veto power being given to any single nation. In this editorial the Washington Post says:

The veto power arises out of the unanimity rule among the Big Five incorporated into

the Dumbarton Oaks plan, without which coercive action against transgressors cannot be taken. It thus makes any one of the big powers a potential obstructionist. It puts a premium upon bad intentions.

Under such a voting system only a few instances where one great power committed an act of aggression, stood accused by other members of the Supreme Council, and then went scot free by its own vote would wreck any world organization.

For a moment let us apply the proposed voting plan to an incident which even now is taking place. Let us suppose there had been a formal peace declared and let us suppose that the Dumbarton Oaks-Yalta organization had been ratified and set up. The New York Times on its front page this morning carries the story—I shall not read much of it but merely enough to relate a current incident to this veto power:

FRENCH SEIZE PARLIAMENT IN BITTER DAMASCUS BATTLE—SYRIAN CAPITAL REPORTED BOMBED—LEADERS ASK ALLIED INTERCESSION—DE GAULLE FACES CABINET CRISIS

BEIRUT, LEBANON, May 30.—Lebanon tonight called volunteers to the colors as the explosive Near East situation grew more critical and French troops, fighting Arab irregulars in Syria, were reported to have occupied the Parliament building in the capital of Damascus.

Then there is interpolated an editorial comment which I also read:

In a growing French Cabinet crisis Foreign Minister Georges Bidault was said to have considered resigning in protest against Gen. Charles de Gaulle's policies, which had overriden his own cautious attitude toward the Levant. In London the British Cabinet was in emergency session and Foreign Secretary Eden said the Government was in close consultation with Washington on the deteriorated situation.

Now let us suppose the Dumbarton Oaks-Yalta organization was at work and functioning with France, a member of the Supreme Council. No action could be taken by the Council, even to consider this "shooting crisis" in the Levant, unless the French representatives on the Supreme Council voted in the affirmative. In view of the fact that French soldiers are now in action, can anyone in this Chamber or elsewhere conceive that France would permit consideration of this problem? Even if 10 members of the Council thought the situation might bring on another world war and they voted to impose sanctions on France or ordered the use of the military force, which is to be at the command of this organization, all the French representatives would have to do to prevent any action either of an economic or military character would be to vote "no," and the Dumbarton Oaks-Yalta organization would be paralyzed.

Suppose it was considered that this local conflict would develop into a general war, that, if it were not stopped, the fires lighted in this area would spread to the whole Moslem world. Under these circumstances what would be the horrible choice of the United States, Great Britain, and the other 10 nations in the Supreme Council? They would have to decide either to take joint action outside the organization and thus violate their solemn agreement when they rati-

fied the instrument and take steps to suppress the incipient war, or they would have to sit back and say, "We are sorry; the war will have to spread; we cannot do anything about it because the nation which is involved has voted 'no.'"

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I merely wish to ask the Senator if he thinks there would be any doubt that the Republic of France or its government would vote "no"?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would emphasize that I am not using this incident to make any invidious reference to France. I use it, as I have used other incidents in the past, to try to illustrate the point which I am trying to make. I have made only a factual statement and drawn an analogy for that sole purpose.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of this dispatch may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was wondering if the Senator from Wisconsin thought the Senate would be willing to have the United States become a member of the Security Council without that veto power?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that I think the Senate must choose between a workable, practical international organization in which it really has faith and to which it is going to give effective support, predicated upon a just treaty, or if we become a member of an ineffective organization we will have to be forearmed and set up our own imperialistic form of security, just as it seems to me Russia is already doing, because apparently she has no faith in the efficacy of the organization which is being created. I think those are the alternatives. I believe that when the Members come to this question they will be forced to take one or the other of the horns of the dilemma. So far as I am concerned, I will say to the Senator, I would much prefer to see worked out a practical democratic organization which would be able to enforce a just peace than I would to go down the road of imperialism and power politics, involving prodigious military expenditures for generation after generation and involving the certainty of future war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator think it would be very helpful to the representatives of the State Department if they had some idea of just how far the Senate is willing to go in bringing about such an organization?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is no practical way I know of to determine that question in advance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Proper debates on the floor would develop it. I think the Senator is making a fine contribution, and I want to compliment him for doing it. He has been one of the very few who have done it, even though we are trying to set up this organization.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I fear we were committed at Yalta to this one-big-nation veto power; I fear that is the situation; but I cannot say with certainty, because as we all know the discussions there were secret and we can only learn a little here and a little there. The little I have been able to gather, however, has convinced me that the veto voting agreement was made at Yalta and that our delegates at San Francisco feel bound by it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have heard it said by a good many people that they did not think the Senate would join if Senators thought our forces would be used in some conflict where we did not want them to be, in other words, if we did not have a veto; and I think that is a fairly general opinion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not suppose any man can speak for the Senate, but I have served in this body now nearly 20 years, and I have a great respect for it and I have great respect for the individual Members. I believe that any student of this question will come to the conclusion that we must "fish or cut bait" on this issue. We must either have a democratic international organization set up to enforce a just peace which can be successfully enforced, and be willing to take the logical steps necessary to achieve those two objectives, or we will have to disregard the organization, even though we may join it, and go on with the program of imperialism, power politics, balances of power, and military alliances. Such a course will produce the worst aspects of both policies, and none of the benefits of either.

Once more the Senator has tempted me to state in a few sentences a complex proposition which one should have an hour to elaborate in order to make one's position crystal clear.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I apologize for intruding.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I very much appreciate the interest of the able Senator from Arkansas. I know he has given great study to these questions, and I am complimented that he has been so attentive during this long discourse.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The question of the veto power is one which gives all of us concern. I do not know whether the Senator from Wisconsin is prepared to express an opinion, a speculative opinion, in regard to what the Senate might do, but let us for the moment forget Yalta, and forget any agreements about veto power. We all remember that one of the things which interfered with the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles was the feeling that the United States might be outvoted in the council there set up. The Senator is familiar with all that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Regardless of Yalta and any agreement, secret or otherwise, which may have been entered into there, does the Senator from Wisconsin feel that he is in a position to express an opinion as to what the Senate of the United States might do and what our people might feel in regard to the power of the Council in determining what ac-

tion might be taken on the use of military force or economic sanctions if the United States, as one of the five great powers, did not have power to say "No" upon any exercises of those powers which might be voted by the other nations?

Just one further question. Taking into account our own situation, forgetting Russia for the moment, if we voted "no" against the use of power from a military standpoint, or the use of sanctions from an economic standpoint, how much would that contribute to a possible war? How much would our protest avail against being forced into the use of military or economic power, if the rest of the nations had the power to compel us to do that? As between those two situations, which is likely to contribute most to the peace of the world?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in answer to the first part of the Senator's question, of course, I have no more information than has the able majority leader, and probably not as much, as to what the attitude of the Senate would be on this question. But the reason I took the Japanese seizure of Manchuria in 1931 and the current "shooting crisis" in the Levant as examples was to dramatize to the Senate the manner in which this big-power veto by one nation will paralyze the Dumbarton Oaks organization whenever it is confronted by a serious situation involving a big power.

I will say to the Senator that if we are going into such an organization, if we are going into it in good faith, then we should be willing to go far enough to make it workable. All these high abstract phrases, all this verbal and nebulous internationalism is not worth the paper it is written on, or the electrical energy which it takes to convey it through the air waves. It is the practical type of working organization which is set up on the one hand, and the kind of a peace which is created on the other, which will determine whether the world is going to seize this second opportunity in 27 years to determine if there is some other way to settle these problems than by blood letting and the vast destruction of capital and property.

I will say to the Senator frankly that if we are going into this thing, if it is to be effective, something will have to be done about the veto power. The aggressions of the future, certainly the immediate future, are not coming from Germany or Japan, they are not coming from any of the liberated countries, they are not coming from any of the Axis satellites. If aggressions are perpetrated after the peace, they will be perpetrated by one of the big powers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield further at that point?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not have to assure the Senator my appreciation of his sincerity on this or any other subject.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am ready to "fish or cut bait" on this issue, and I think everyone else should be. I think we should stop this double talk about creating a world security organization when creeping paralysis has been injected into it before it is ever born. It has creeping paralysis congenitally if veto power of one nation remains,

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator's reference to "fish or cut bait." So far as I am concerned, I am ready to fish.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So am I.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not going to cut bait.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt very much whether we can pass categorically on an instrument which is not yet complete.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I know that. That is why I am making this speech. I am an humble Member of this body, and I do not suppose my words will have any weight, but this speech has been stewing in my system for a long time, and the only thing that has prevented me from making it before was the fact that we had a war going on, a global war, on two fronts, and all around the world. But now I think it is time for me to speak, and I want to get it on the record.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator is entirely too modest in his assertion that he does not know whether what he says may have influence.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If that remark is offensive to the Senator from Kentucky, I shall withdraw it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all; it is not offensive, but I do not want the Senator to underestimate his own influence.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not have to tell the Senator that I have great respect for his views on this or any other subject.

When the instrument as it will be completed by the San Francisco conference comes to us, we will have to accept it as it is, or with reservations or interpretations, as we may have the right to put them in. We may be confronted with the problem of accepting an instrument which gives to the five great powers, or any one of them, including ourselves, the power of veto, or scrapping the whole thing. I am wondering whether the American people, or the Senate, or the world, is ready to scrap the whole process, the whole works, because it contains a provision that the five great powers who have shouldered the responsibility of defeating the forces of evil in this world cataclysm, as I take them to be, should have a power of veto; whether we should scrap the whole thing, and throw it out the window, because it may contain a provision for veto by any one of the great powers on the use of economic or military force, or whether we will accept it in the hope that it may be improved and worked out as time goes on, as our Constitution has been, as the constitution of any new government must be worked out.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky will not find anything in my remarks suggesting that I think it ought to be scrapped, but I am suggesting ways to improve it. A little while ago I suggested very respectfully that I hoped the delegates in San Francisco would not feel under the prod of a dead line. I expressed the hope that they would stay on the job until they have threshed out these major issues and have the best solution they can obtain.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator is on sound ground in that respect.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I read every day that the conferees want to leave on Friday, and then they put it off until Tuesday, and then put it off until Monday again.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what their plan is.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not, either, but I do know that there is no rush about it. This organization does not have any wood to saw up right now, and they had better get it in the best form they can.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the best the delegates know how. I agree.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope the big-power representatives will listen to some of the able men from some of the countries which are not so large. They do not wield great military power, but that is no reason why they do not have great experience, a sound point of view, and something constructive to contribute to the discussion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator, if he will permit me one further interruption, that it would be better for the conference to work together for a week or 2 weeks or even a month longer, if there is a prospect of getting a better instrument by that delay, than to fix a dead line by which to adjourn, but I think they will probably be the best judges as to when they have accomplished all they can accomplish.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I do not think they would be justified in delaying an agreement simply in order to create a public impression that they were deliberating beyond the point where they can work out a workable agreement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator had heard what I stated—

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry I did not hear it all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I said that I had hoped that they would stay there just as long as there was any hope of making the instrument better.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the point I rose to make was that if, when it comes to us, it contains the provision authorizing the veto by any of the five great powers, of which we are one, we will be confronted then with the problem whether to accept the instrument with the veto power in it, or possibly to scrap it because there is a veto power in it, and individually I would hesitate a long time before I would throw the work of San Francisco and Dumbarton Oaks and the hopes of the world out of the window simply because there was contained in the agreement a veto power on the part of any one of these great powers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have not used the verb "throw" and I have not used the noun "window," and I do not think anything I have said is subject to that implication.

Mr. BARKLEY. But we know there is such a verb and such a noun.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. The Senator just spoke of throwing it out of the window. I did not use that expression.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think when the time comes for the Senate to pass on the question of veto, which the Senator from Wisconsin has discussed, we will either have to fish or cut bait.

The Senator made a remark earlier in his speech which impressed me very much. If this has been a war between Fascist and imperialist powers, and if all that is going to be accomplished in the long run is for people who have been in slavery for years to return to their old masters, if they are to have no say about their future and about their lives in the future, then in the first place it is no wonder that they have not been willing to contribute more to the Allied success in the war. The Senators who traveled around the world were told by Arabs in French Morocco, for example, that under the terms of the Atlantic Charter they thought they ought to be free from the French if the Allies won the war. They suggested that the people of the United States were bound to see to it that that freedom came to them. The people of Egypt thought they had the right to be free from the British, and the people of India thought they had the right to be free from the British.

If all we have accomplished here is to set up an organization really composed of five great powers, each one of which will have the right of the veto, and to say "No," which would automatically put them out of the organization, then it would leave to the little fellows nothing except to shuffle for themselves, even though they were told by the Allies when the fight was going on that they had a right to be free from fear, be free from want, and to have the other freedoms.

I confess that I greatly appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin, a great part of which I have had the privilege of hearing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate very much the Senator's attention to my remarks.

Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for making another reference to past history, I think the failure of the League to take action against Japan when she went into Manchuria was a mortal blow to the League itself. Let no one get up on the floor and tell me its failure to act then was because the United States was not a member of the League. We took the initiative in that crisis. Secretary of State Stimson invoked the Nine-Power Pact. He sought to get the cooperation of Great Britain and the League. But because Great Britain then had an alliance with Japan, we were unable to obtain the cooperation either of Great Britain or of the League in enforcing the Nine-Power Pact and in checking Japan's aggression into Manchuria.

This was the first great blow to the League of Nations as an instrument for peace. The second came in 1935 when the big powers which dominated the League refused to stop Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia. These two tragic examples of impotence sealed the doom of the League of Nations.

So I say, it would only be necessary to have one example of a great power committing an aggression under the Dumbarton Oaks-Yalta scheme and vot-

ing against the other 10 members of the Council to prevent action, in order to wreck that organization, just as I think the League of Nations received mortal blows when it failed to act in the case of Japan and Manchuria in 1931 and Mussolini and Italy and Ethiopia in 1935.

Mr. President, I know that it will be said that the present five great powers are peace-loving nations. But even if they are that at present how can we be certain they will always remain so? I have a long memory as to what has taken place through the years right here in this Senate Chamber. I can remember when during and after the First World War Japan and Italy were repeatedly referred to by Senators on the floor as among the "righteous," "peace-loving" nations because they were then associated with us in waging war and in writing the peace.

The past shows us that sometimes governments change; and their policies change; that those which seemed to be peace-loving may in a few years become imperialistic and perpetrate aggression. Therefore we should not rely upon a form of organization which can suddenly be paralyzed and perhaps wrecked by the vote of one nation which may be desirous of achieving an imperialistic purpose.

Any such arrangement is visionary and unrealistic because it ignores the lessons of the past. Furthermore it is not based upon a realistic view of the situation which prevails in Europe now that the war has ended there nor upon the situation that will prevail when the war against Japan is ended. At the end of this war Germany and Japan will both be devastated physically, disorganized politically, and impotent as military menaces. If we are as firm as we should be in our determination to keep them disarmed, neither of these former powers can possibly be an important threat to the peace of the world. Certainly none of the other former Axis Nations—Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, or even impoverished Spain—can seriously be regarded as a major threat to peace unless one or more of these nations should in the future be allied with a great power or a group of powers. None of the small nations which have been liberated from the Axis yoke looms as a potential aggressor.

THE ONLY POWERS CAPABLE OF AGGRESSION ARE
THE BIG POWERS

From a political and military standpoint the only nations which can start an aggression which might bring on another world war are the five big powers. Therefore, the Dumbarton Oaks provision which permits one of the Big Five to veto sanctions against herself could readily become a device to provide one of the conquering great powers with license for precisely the type of aggressive acts which inevitably bring war. I cannot see how any world organization can enforce peace with a voting provision such as is now proposed.

OTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF
DUMBARTON OAKS

It seems to me unfortunate from the standpoint of an effective organization that the security council has not been enlarged to include at least six more na-

tions, in order to provide far broader representation and a greater cross-section of world opinion, and that two-thirds vote be required to invoke economic or military sanctions, in order to prevent a single great power from standing successfully—and legally—against the world.

There are other improvements which would make of the Dumbarton Oaks plan a far more democratic and workable organization:

First. The charter should be made easier to amend. It was the wisdom of the founding fathers in providing for the amendment of our Constitution which has made it possible for that document to meet the sweeping changes of more than a hundred and fifty years.

Second. Membership should be opened eventually to all nations which have proved their willingness to abide by the principles of the world organization.

Third. Greater scope should be given to the assembly in order to provide for a more representative determination of issues which will inevitably confront this organization.

Fourth. Far greater emphasis and prestige should be attached to the work of the economic and social council. This agency of the Dumbarton Oaks plan seems to me to be the most potentially useful branch of the organization, just as I think the work of a scientific character and the work in health, education, and labor carried on by the League of Nations was its most effective work.

Fifth. The principles of the Atlantic Charter, which are a modest enough expression of the ideals of all freedom-loving peoples, should be incorporated into the proposed document as a minimum standard of conduct for all nations becoming members of the organization.

Sixth. The charter of the proposed world organization should include a world bill of rights, through which the signatory nations pledge themselves to preserve and to extend religious and political freedom, civil liberties, racial equality, the protection of minorities, and the abolition of human slavery and imperialism.

As I said in the outset of my remarks, Mr. President, this is one of the great turning points of history. The people of America do not shrink from the responsibilities which modern technology and the war have thrust upon them. They accept the challenge with the same pioneering zeal, the dauntless courage, and the passion for freedom and democracy which sent their grandfathers and great-grandfathers across 3,000 miles of danger-ridden wilderness to build a new and a free society not only for themselves but for the oppressed of all lands.

The new frontier is as challenging as the old, but no challenge has ever been met by running away from it. We shall get off to a false start if we fail to recognize—

First. That the Dumbarton Oaks plan now being considered at San Francisco needs basic overhauling if it is to become a genuinely democratic instrument for the preservation of peace;

Second. That the international organization will fail unless the peace it is erected to enforce is a just and honorable peace, a peace founded on tolerance,

not vengeance; on freedom, not imperialism; on genuine international cooperation, not a facade for military alliances; on the genuine principle of self-determination, not power politics and great-power domination; and most of all on a clear realization that the basic causes of war are social, economic, and political in character. Unless there is a united determination to get at those causes of social, political, and economic dislocation, we shall have tricked ourselves, by relying solely on the might of an organization, into a false and treacherous sense of security.

It seems to me fundamental that if the United States is to play an active, perhaps decisive, role in world affairs, we must harness our activities to a basic American policy—a policy rooted in the American ideal of political freedom and economic opportunity for all.

It is perfectly clear from developments in Europe during the past year or more that we do not have such a policy.

Editorial writers and public speakers talk glibly of America's new role in world affairs. But their writings and speeches do not contain a clear-cut, affirmative expression of what that role shall be.

WE HAVE NOT HAD A CONSISTENT POLICY IN
EUROPE

In the records of our nonmilitary activities in Europe one searches in vain for a connected and coordinated pattern of behavior. Too often we have shown marked evidence of an inferiority complex. Too often we have been content to let our representatives abroad become mere yes men for our allies. And too often we have allowed the name and honor of this country to be associated with policies which are repugnant alike to the democratic-minded peoples of both Europe and the United States.

We have failed to throw our moral strength into the balance for reconstruction of liberated nations in anywhere near the degree that we have pitted our military strength against the enemy for the destruction of fascism and nazism. Instead we have drifted and vacillated dangerously, and thereby have confused the people at home and abroad.

Too many of us forget that the death of Hitler has not removed a single cause of Hitlerism. Too many of us find it easy to hope that a package marked Peace, postmarked San Francisco, will be delivered to us some day soon, free of charge. Too many of us overlook the simple fact that there must be sweat and toil in peacemaking if we are to escape the blood and tears of war. There are no easy answers to peace.

Six years ago another big three met at Munich and worked out an easy answer. Their names were Hitler, Daladier, and Chamberlain, and one of them, the late Mr. Chamberlain, proclaimed they had bought peace for our time—by appeasing a dictatorship, by selling out small and helpless countries—without dealing in a fundamental way with any of the basic problems which were eating their way, like a cancer, through the body of all Europe.

PROPOSED PRINCIPLES OF AN AMERICAN FOREIGN
POLICY

In our rejoicing over the end of the European war we must not forget that

every economic problem which existed in Europe when the war began is still there, but in greatly aggravated form. Those problems are not insoluble. But to solve them we must shed our mood of frustration and face up to them with courageous realism. I propose that our Government proclaim a series of basic principles as the cornerstone of American foreign policy—the cornerstone on which we proposed to build our relations with the rest of the world. These principles are:

First, America is prepared to aid all nations—allied, liberated, and former enemy countries—to help themselves in the great task of reconstruction. We cannot rebuild for them. But we can provide relief for the tragic present and long-time credits for the longer pull.

Second, America is ready to aid European nations in creating a confederation of European states on a federal principle of local and cultural autonomy similar to Switzerland and this country. But America is not committed to supporting the doctrine of great power domination or the balance-of-power theory.

Third, America is determined to see that all Nazi and Fascist criminals are brought to trial.

Fourth, America is firm in her determination to lend support to democratic principles and democratic aspirations. But she refuses to lend her support to the extension of slavery or totalitarianism.

Fifth, America stands ready to cooperate with all nations of the world to preserve a just, a democratic peace through the instrumentality of a practical world organization built on democratic lines.

Sixth, America recognizes that a sound structure of peace is much more than a matter of political arrangements. Economic considerations are vital in any planning for a just and lasting peace.

Seventh, America knows how powerful a role her own Bill of Rights has played in shaping the destiny of this country, and therefore calls upon the nations of the world to write an international bill of rights to protect the peoples of all countries.

Eighth, America is aware of the fact that, for all our desire to help rebuild the rest of the world, we would be faithless to our own people and the peoples of other nations who look to us for example and inspiration unless we put our own house in order.

This challenging task we must begin now by projecting a policy for the United States which will provide useful and self-respecting employment for everyone who is willing to work. We stand before a new frontier of opportunity, an era of plastics and light metals. If we meet the challenge of the new frontier wisely we can provide opportunities for security, education, health, housing, and recreation such as we have never had before.

Too many of us have failed to understand the explosive character of the period in which we live. This has been and is more than a war. It is a revolution.

America has a great constructive role to play at this critical juncture. America's role is to prove that economic abun-

dance can be attained without sacrificing political freedom and human liberty. Here in the United States we can demonstrate that both are attainable if we have the courage, the vision, and the perseverance to plan and work for them. But in achieving this goal we must resist the Pied Pipers who would take us down some easy road which can only end in bitter disillusionment and the loss of our fundamental liberties.

Let us join with the other nations to preserve peace, but let us never give our consent or support to any extension of slavery, great power domination, or imperialism.

Let us cooperate to extend freedom, democracy, and equality of opportunity to all men, regardless of race, color, or creed.

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of May 31, 1945]

FRENCH SEIZE PARLIAMENT IN BITTER DAMASCUS BATTLE—SYRIAN CAPITAL REPORTED BOMBED—LEADERS ASK ALLIED INTERCESSION—DE GAULLE FACES CABINET CRISIS

BEIRUT, LEBANON, May 30.—Lebanon tonight called volunteers to the colors as the explosive Near East situation grew more critical and French troops, fighting Arab irregulars in Syria, were reported to have occupied the Parliament building in the capital of Damascus.

Arab tribesmen, west of the Djebel Druze, were reported to have attacked French troops in Hauran Province and to have captured several garrisons. French officials here said they had lost contact with their outposts.

The situation was obscure, but it was feared that several thousand of the fanatic Druze tribesmen had risen against their old enemies, the French, with whom they fought a sanguinary war in 1926.

Although no direct government action had been taken by either of the Levant states against France, Lebanese President Bachara el Khoury signed a decree calling for volunteers between the ages of 18 and 35. Several bureaus were established to handle the national guard.

In a growing French Cabinet crisis Foreign Minister Georges Bidault was said to have considered resigning in protest against Gen. Charles de Gaulle's policies, which had overridden his own cautious attitude toward the Levant. In London the British Cabinet was in emergency session and Foreign Secretary Eden said the Government was in close consultation with Washington on the deteriorated situation. One report by the British Broadcasting Corporation quoted the Prime Minister of Syria as saying, "Our aim is to liquidate all our former relations with France. We shall not give strategic bases and there is no question of the French enjoying any privileges here that other nations do not enjoy equally."

The fiercest fighting was centered at Damascus, where French troops employed planes as well as mortars and artillery in fighting the irregulars. The French said Syrian gendarmes, backed by partisans, led the assaults against French positions in Damascus.

The natives apparently had planned the attack carefully, one French official said, although there was "no reason to believe the Syrian Government was involved."

Meanwhile, Syrian President Shukri al Kuwaty appealed to United States Minister George Wadsworth and British Minister Terence Shone for immediate intercession. He also protested the French air bombardment of Damascus.

In Damascus a 2-hour truce was called from 4 to 6 p. m. to permit the evacuation of civilians.

Two American citizens, known to have been in Damascus during the French shelling, es-

caped injury. They were the American consul, William Porter, of Fall River, Mass., and William Gillespie of Stamford, Conn., head of the Office of War Information in Damascus.

One British officer was killed and another wounded during the shelling of the Orient Palace Hotel. Mr. Gillespie escaped injury, although bullets whistled through his room. The United States consulate was slightly damaged.

During the shelling, the central prison was hit and several hundred prisoners escaped. Col. Artine Bey, head of the Syrian gendarmes in Damascus, was reported to have been seriously wounded yesterday.

French planes were reported to have bombed and strafed both Damascus and the town of Hama, to the north. The reports were conflicting. One version was that only a single plane had attacked Damascus. Native gendarmes were said to have shot down one plane at Hama with small-arms fire.

Parts of the Syrian Parliament, the Syrian Government House and the Orient Palace Hotel in Damascus had been damaged by shelling when the French broke into the Parliament Building early this morning after blowing up the front gate with a shell from a 75-millimeter gun.

Armed civilians were said to have launched another attack on the French barracks and troops in Damascus. Many were killed and wounded on both sides.

Civilian communications between Damascus and Beirut were cut. The American Legation here said the United States consul in Damascus rode in a British armored car from the consulate to confer with President Kuwaty. It was through the United States consul that President Kuwaty made his appeal for British-American intercession.

The explosive situation throughout Syria and Lebanon stemmed from French demands for certain exclusive privileges in the two countries that they were apparently determined not to grant. However, there has been no action by either Government against France—only the outbreaks by indignant civilians.

The situation at Homs and Aleppo was reported quieter, but it was feared fighting would break out anew when news of the fierce struggle in Damascus spread.

The Djebel Druze had not joined in the uprising. However, Sultan Basma el Atrash had convened all Druze leaders at his mountain stronghold at Salkha for a conference. The sultan has several thousand armed troops at his disposal.

EXHIBIT B

BULGARIA

At the beginning of 1944 negotiations were under way designed to bring about a Bulgarian surrender to the Allies. But the time for a surrender was not yet ripe. Bulgaria was still under tight German control, though the Bulgarians had not fired a shot in Germany's behalf. The Russians had not yet captured Odessa nor set foot on Rumanian territory. There was no certainty that the Anglo-Americans would invade France—and do so successfully. The fate of Italy, which had surrendered some time previously, was not such as to encourage the Bulgarians to do likewise.

It is important to remember that Bulgaria was not then at war with Soviet Russia. Though Bulgaria was Germany's ally, and deeply indebted to her for many favors, she had refused to join in the battle against Russia. True, Bulgaria had permitted Germany to send German troops across her lands to participate in the conquest of Yugoslavia and Greece, but the Russians at the time were Germany's partners. The deal that Hitler and Stalin made for the partition of Poland was then in full bloom.

France was invaded—successfully. And then the Russians began to threaten Bul-

garia. They warned the Bulgars that they were "playing with fire." They protested against the use of Bulgaria's Black Sea ports by the Germans. They demanded new concessions. In July they handed the Bulgarians a virtual ultimatum demanding that they cease cooperating with the Germans.

In August, Turkey broke relations with Germany. Almost at once the Bulgarians began to show a real desire to get out of the war. The Bulgarian Prime Minister made a speech before Parliament advocating an immediate withdrawal from the war. People carried him through the streets of Sofia shouting, "Long live the savior of Bulgaria." The Bulgarians were now obviously ready to sign.

They could sign only with the British and the Americans, with whom they were at war. They could not sign with Russia—they were at peace with Russia, technically speaking, and Russia's representative was still in residence at the Bulgarian capital.

On August 30, a Bulgarian peace commission reached Cairo to sign terms with the Anglo-Americans—terms of "unconditional surrender." The Russians were consulted regarding these terms but their ambassador in London declared that Russia was not much interested, that this was an Anglo-American affair, and that they were grateful to be kept informed.

Like a bolt from the blue, and with only a few minutes' warning to their Anglo-American allies, the Soviet Union then declared war on Bulgaria. This completely changed the picture. Soviet troops invaded Bulgaria. The Bulgars asked for an armistice. There was a Communist uprising and a blood bath in Sofia. Former regents and premiers were arrested—and promptly shot. All Bulgarian ministers from 1941 on were ordered arrested. Newspapers were shut down. People were deported.

The Bulgar-Russian War ended in 4 days. And Bulgarian peace commissioners, having withdrawn from Cairo, then set out for Moscow. There they received terms which called upon the Bulgarians to retire back into their own borders, required the Bulgarian Army to come under Russian control, required apprehension of war criminals, supervision of propaganda and education by the Allies, Soviet use of Bulgar ships in the Black Sea and on the Danube, and a reparations bill to be set later, now amounting to 525,000,000 leva a month. The terms called for free movement of Allied forces and supervision of the terms of the armistice by an Allied Control Commission.

A new Communist-dominated government called the Fatherland Front was called into being. It did cause the Bulgars to retire within their own borders. It did bring the Bulgarian Army under Russian control—and the Russians promptly sent the Army off to fight in Hungary, where it still is unable to get home. It did bring about the apprehension of "war criminals"; some 20,000 Bulgarians were shot as the result of drum-head trials or no trials at all. It did bring censorship, but not Allied censorship, merely Russian censorship. It did not free Allied prisoners of war, as required; Polish soldiers are still in Bulgarian prisons and some have been shipped to camps in Russia. It decidedly did not permit Allied representatives to travel freely in Bulgaria; even today American and British officers are restricted in their movements in this country, cannot budge out of the area in which they live in Sofia, cannot even go to the airport, in fact, without a Russian "companion."

As in Rumania, the Allied Control Commission is entirely Russian. The Russian general who runs it did entirely as he pleased for some months. Now, as the result of continuous protests by the British and American representatives, he kindly consents to let our representatives see his decrees as they are published. That's as far as our

influence goes. We were not even told that Bulgaria was recognizing the Russian-sponsored Polish Government until after it had happened.

What would Americans say if they knew that the Soviets announced recently in the name of the Allied Control Commission that messages for London and for the United States through London have to be routed through Moscow. Neither the British nor American representatives were consulted on this decision, obviously.

EXHIBIT C RUMANIA

Rumania occupied a special place in Russia's plans. Since the beginning of the Russo-German war, Rumania had been Germany's ally. Rumania provided Germany with troops and was useful economically and politically. Germany got a third of her oil from Rumania and nearly half the mica she needed; also cotton, wool, and other essential materials. In addition, Rumania was a monument of the supposed Axis solidarity in the Balkans.

Rumania was Germany's unwilling ally. Rumania had been the friend of Poland and France and counted for her safety on German-Russian antagonism. When Poland collapsed, divided between the Germans and the Russians, Rumania was helpless. Between Germans and Russians, Rumania promptly lost a quarter of her territory and about 7,000,000 people. She had left an area twice the size of New York State and 12,000,000 subjects—twice the population of New York City.

After the Russians had defeated the Axis at Stalingrad, swept the Germans out of the Ukraine, recaptured Odessa, and forced evacuation of the Crimea, they regrouped for the assault on Rumania. Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov then broadcast the following statement:

"The Soviet Government has no intention to acquire any part of Rumanian territory or to change the existing social structure in Rumania or to infringe in any way upon the independence of Rumania. On the contrary, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to establish, together with the Rumanian people, the independence of Rumania by freeing Rumania from the Fascist yoke."

Russia's propaganda attack was successful. King Michael believed this statement and personally engineered a coup d'etat. He announced—on August 23, last—that he had accepted surrender to the Russians. The next day Rumania declared war on Germany.

Russian troops swept through Rumania. Rumanian leaders were arrested. Oil depots were captured. Vehicles were requisitioned. Communications and customs were taken in hand. Propaganda was placed under Russian control. Newspapers were curtailed. Radios were confiscated. An American mission attempting to take pictures of the damage our bombers had done at Ploesti was forced by the Russians to discontinue its investigations.

The Russians forced upon Rumania armistice terms which called for drastic reductions in the Rumanian Army, which was to come under Russian command and fight against Germany and Hungary. They called for war trials and an indemnity of \$300,000,000 over the next 6 years, tantamount to turning over to Russia all of Rumania's exports and imports for a period of 4 years. Russian military control dominated the Rumanian scene and Rumania was isolated from the Anglo-Saxon world.

The Russians then forced out the cabinet in power. In an extraordinary act of dictatorship, Vyshinski gave the Rumanian King just an hour and 5 minutes in which to appoint a new cabinet in which Communists would have the controlling positions—this despite the fact that the Com-

munists number no more than 15 percent of Rumania's population.

Whole factories have been removed to Russia. Equipment belonging to American companies has been taken away—and our protests ignored. Arrests have been common. Some 80,000 persons have been forcibly shipped out of Rumania to labor for the Russians. A tight censorship has been imposed.

Sweeping changes were made in the Rumanian Army—and the army itself not permitted to return to Rumania from Czechoslovakia, where it was forced to fight under most unfavorable circumstances.

The demands for reparations have been increased to the point where Rumania's economy is all but ruined. Since August of a year ago the cost of living has gone up 429 percent. Bank notes in circulation have increased nearly 100 percent. All agricultural equipment has been taken over by the state. Small businesses and stores have been bankrupted.

Rumania's middle class has been deliberately ruined and there is no doubt but that the country is being Sovietized. It will not be long before Rumania is just another state of the Soviet Union.

It is true that there is a so-called Allied Control Commission in Rumania, supposedly to see that the terms of the armistice are carried out. But the chairman of this commission is a Russian general and his British and American counterparts have nothing to say about the acts of the commission—nothing at all. At times the American and British generals do not know what has been done in their names until they hear about it from agonized Rumanians. At this very moment the movement of British and American officers is severely restricted—and we are supposed to be Russia's allies.

In view of Molotov's promise that Russia has no intention of changing the existing social structure in Rumania or infringing in any way upon the independence of Rumania, in view of the agreements made at Yalta, what is the thoughtful American to think—that American who earnestly believes we were fighting to bring freedom to an enslaved world?

Here is what the American and British Governments think: On March 15 the United States and Great Britain formally asked the Soviet Union for an explanation of its actions in Rumania, actions clearly contrary to agreements freely reached, actions clearly contrary to American hopes and ideals, actions which contain the seeds of still another world war. If any answer has been made by the Soviet Union to date, it has not yet been made public.

EXHIBIT D BORNHOLM ISLAND

The island of Bornholm is a small island in the Baltic Sea, off the southern coast of Sweden, half way distant between the Swedish city of Karlskrona and the island of Rugen. It has belonged for centuries to Denmark. Its population is pure Danish. In 1940, it was occupied by the Germans along with the rest of Denmark. Thereafter, they maintained a moderate garrison on the island until the final catastrophe.

The island is of considerable strategic importance to Russia, constituting an advanced outpost for them in the western Baltic. Its possession, however, would not give the Russians access to the Atlantic, so long as English influence prevailed at Kiel and Copenhagen.

In March when the Germans on Bornholm were ready for surrender, Soviet planes staged a bitter air attack on the towns of this island, virtually destroying one and half destroying another, killing many innocent Danes and affecting the surrender of Germans not one whit. It was a totally unnecessary show of Russian power.

On March 7, about 1,500 Russian troops were shipped by sea and air transport to Bornholm. The German garrison surrendered. In the following weeks these prisoners were transferred rapidly to the mainland but additional Soviet troops were brought to the island.

Danish sovereignty is still apparently recognized by the Soviet troops, who, however, have put down a tight news embargo on the island. Prevalent rumors suggest that the Russians will begin shortly the construction of one or more airfields on the island. Their troops seem to be on Danish soil for an indefinite period.

Denmark, Sweden, and Great Britain are much exercised about the Russian occupation of this strategic island. It is the consensus of almost all Allied observers in Scandinavia that the Russians are on Bornholm to stay.

[From the New York Times of May 27, 1945]
RUSSIANS SEEM PREPARED TO STAY ON DANISH ISLAND OF BORNHOLM
 (Kal Myring)

HASLE (on Russian-occupied Bornholm), May 25.—I am the only correspondent of an American newspaper who has set foot on Bornholm after its occupation by the Russians.

I arrived after a hazardous 4½-hour journey from Sweden in an open 19-foot motorboat, flying the Swedish flag, and have spent more than a day in the Russian headquarters jail, being questioned to an extent approaching the third degree by the Russian military. If I return to Sweden it may be only because I gave a Russian official two bottles of aquavit and some coffee and tea brought from Sweden.

The Russian official emptied the bottles with his adjutant right away and he pronounced the 100-proof Swedish liquor better than vodka, and he gave me my exit permit. That is why I have decided to hasten to Sweden before he changes his mind.

It is rough at sea and the visibility is poor, and when we get away the Russians could not find us even if they wanted to, although they patrol the waters around the island with speedboats and seaplanes to prevent any illegal traffic with Bornholm.

There are about three Russian battalions, about 7,000 men, on Bornholm. There are two light infantry battalions and one heavy, with 80-millimeter guns and 32-millimeter antitank guns, according to Danes on the island.

During the questioning I was carted back and forth between Hasle and Roenne. After I had answered all questions satisfactorily to the Russians I had liberty of movement on the island but had to promise not to try to leave without permission. In voyaging around the island for 3 days I was able to observe most of what is going on.

The enthusiasm of the Bornholmers for the Russians has cooled considerably since the first few days when the Russians landed to drive the German occupants out. In the first enthusiasm over the arrival of the Russians the Bornholmers even forgot their bitterness over the Soviet bombing of their garden towns.

Uncertainty about the length of the Russians' stay has set in and the Bornholmers are pessimistic. There also are language troubles. Most of the Russians here speak nothing but Russian and sign language has been unsatisfactory.

Bornholmers are dissatisfied because the Russians limited their fishing, their main occupation. The Russians decreed that no fisherman must stray farther from shore than 10 nautical miles at the risk of being sunk. The Bornholmers claim it is an infringement on Danish freedom.

LONG STAY IS INDICATED

Russian remarks and information from Danes indicate the Russians are on Bornholm to stay, at least for a long time. They have constructed an airfield 2 miles north of Roenne and are installing themselves on the island and making plans for the future in a way that gives the impression of permanence.

I got along well with the Russians once I had allayed their suspicions. My few Russian words were sufficient to carry on conversations. I played blackjack for money stakes, first with my Soviet guards when I was under arrest and then with Russian soldiers in different taverns.

I had Swedish silver coins worth from two and a half to twelve and a half American cents each. The Russians played with German 1,000-mark notes and Polish 500-zloty notes and laughed when they lost. But I was careful to lose this worthless paper money back to them.

I made the trip to Bornholm in a motorboat chartered from a fisherman in Simrishamn, Sweden. We almost did not get there. Just off Hasle a Soviet fighter plane swooped over our deck and I thought he was going to machine-gun us.

On landing in Hasle my fisherman companion and I were met by a Russian sentry who took us to headquarters, where a colonel expressed his suspicion that we were spies. He took a telephone and thundered to the person on the other end:

"Why didn't you sink the motorboat?"

ALL OFFICIALS SUSPICIOUS

Then we were bundled off to a political official of higher rank. Suspicion was the keynote everywhere. My scant Russian quickly gave out and we carried on in broken German until a Danish interpreter was called. We were kept in the headquarters overnight and then hauled off to Roenne to be examined by the Russian commander in chief, Colonel Strepkoff, but he would not receive us.

Instead, he had us referred to the counter-espionage chief. This was a very tough official. He fired unceasing questions. Following this questioning the fisherman and I were liberated.

The Russians brought their own cattle to the island so as not to make inroads into the Bornholmers' food supplies, but introduced hoof and mouth disease. The Russian cattle spread throughout the island, infecting the island's livestock and necessitating wholesale butchering of cattle. To combat the disease the Russians brought in their own veterinarians.

The food situation is good, with eggs, beef, and pork abundant. The Russians have not made a single requisition. There is no coffee, tea, or chocolate, and liquor and tobacco can be found only in the black market.

[From the New York Times of May 23, 1945]
BORNHOLM CALLED RUSSIAN DENMARK—CORRESPONDENT SAYS SOVIET TROOPS APPEAR TO BE THERE FOR INDEFINITE PERIOD—SEES NO RUSSIAN FLAG—DANISH RULERS' PICTURES ARE IN RED ARMY QUARTERS, BUT NO PHOTOGRAPH OF STALIN

(By Kal Myring)

SIMRISHAMN, SWEDEN, May 26.—The sum total of my impressions of the three-day illegal visit to Russian Bornholm, which belongs to Denmark, is that the island is firmly under Soviet rule and will continue so indefinitely. It is true that, so far, the Russians have not undertaken any fortifications there; nevertheless, they are obviously free to build such fortifications any time they deem it desirable.

The reason I believe the Russians intend to stay indefinitely is that Soviet political officers attached to the Soviet occupation

troops have told the soldiers that they are in Russian Denmark. I aired this matter with a Red Army political major during a dinner talk. He asked me how far it was to Sweden. I replied: "About 25 miles—you know, we are just off the Swedish coast."

He shook his head paternally saying: "Oh, no, Russia owns no islands off the Swedish coast, so you're wrong."

I stood on my statement, whereupon the major took out a pencil and drew a map of the Baltic to prove his point. On his map Bornholm was just north of Pillau in East Prussia, a good 125 miles east of Bornholm's actual geographical position.

"You see," the major said, "how wrong you are."

"All right," I said, judging it more diplomatic, but I am convinced the major knew just as well as I Bornholm's position in the Baltic Sea.

Red Army soldiers with whom I talked, ate, drank, and played cards repeatedly used the expression "Russian Denmark."

SOVIET BANNER IS ABSENT

I saw no Russian flags anywhere. In fact, in Soviet headquarters at Roenne there were pictures of King Christian and Queen Alexandrine, but none of Stalin.

The Danes retain the civil administration on Bornholm, but the Russians' control of all military matters is tantamount to Moscow sovereignty over the island. Bornholmers can in practice do nothing without Russian approval.

Bornholm fishermen must ask Russian permission 2 hours before setting out. This is an economic hardship on fishermen who do not know that long beforehand whether herring will run then. Once having applied for an exit permit the fishermen must set out or risk the revocation of fishing licenses. If the moment is not propitious for fishing it is a waste of precious motor fuel.

The Russians also decide who is to enter or leave the island, disregarding Danish officials' views. Danes vouch in vain for persons they consider of unquestionable standing.

Bornholm newspapers are not subject to censorship, but the Russians have decreed an export ban on all local newspapers. During my 3 days on the island I never saw one word in the local press detrimental to Russia.

Regarding the equipment of the Russians, I noticed a peculiarity: I saw not a single rifle. The soldiers' equipment consisted of tommy guns or light automatics resembling Bren guns. There was also a profusion of machine guns and 32-mm. antitank guns. I saw no bazookas. I also saw one rocket cannon, to which the Russians credited most of their successes over the Germans. In fact, they went so far as to say it had been the decisive weapon of this war. The cannon fired a shell that, they said, produced an enormously high temperature that destroyed everything within a 150-meter radius. Its use, the Russians said, had made possible most of the major Red Army breakthroughs by clearing the way for the infantry.

OFFICERS FRATERNIZE WITH MEN

Much has been written about Russian women soldiers on Bornholm. In reality, they are fewer than the uniformed women attached to the German forces of occupation on Bornholm. The Russian women soldiers are not attractive—they look far too masculine.

Among the male troops I saw one 8-year-old boy mascot, Grisha. This uniformed child was a waif that the Red Army unit had adopted at Stalingrad and carried along with them all the way. Grisha wore proudly a Russian medal for bravery, plus a revolver just about as big as himself. Needless to say, he was everybody's pet.

Russian soldiers camped mostly outside in tent barracks. Officers lived in hotels, which were not requisitioned in that civilians were allowed there too. In Hasle I stayed in a hotel with many Russian officers. The living quarters seemed to be the only distinction between commissioned officers and the rank and file soldiery. General and private eat the same food, often at the same table.

I tasted some of this general-issue army food in company with a colonel; some captains and privates played cards together. I saw one lieutenant have a heated dispute with a colonel over a pot in a blackjack game, calling the colonel all sorts of names, and the colonel took it all in good grace, as if the two had been civilians. I also saw privates, with hands in pockets, talking to superiors and nobody minding. But all this was in off hours. On duty, discipline is iron handed and orders are executed swiftly and unquestioningly.

These card games into which I was invited afforded plenty of opportunity to study the Russian soldier. The currency in these games consisted of Polish zloty, American-printed Allied occupation reichsmarks—with which Red Army soldiers were plentifully supplied—and rubles. Officers and privates also never stopped to consider exchange rates. Twenty zlotys were equivalent to 20 reichsmarks, although the latter bill in reality was perhaps fifty times superior in purchasing value. But the Swedish 12-cent silver coins really were the blue chips. The Russians gladly risked one of their three- or four-figure banknotes for the chance of possessing a Swedish silver coin.

Where tobacco was concerned, they frowned on the popular-brand American cigarettes I had brought. They preferred to roll their own with Russian general-issue tobacco. For paper they used newspaper or toilet paper—the latter was regarded as especially excellent. Their drinking habits struck me as odd; they drank anything, and liquor transformed them into playful children or ill-tempered ones.

The last thing I saw upon leaving the island was a group of German officers doing longshoremen's work in Roenne, loading ships returning to Kolberg. They evidently were the last Germans there.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

During the delivery of Mr. LA FOLLETTE's speech,

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to be excused for a period of 1 hour to attend a meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary. I would not leave the Chamber at this time, while this very important address is being delivered by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, if it were not for the fact that the nomination of Tom Clark to be Attorney General is before the committee for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary—Salaries," on page 2, line 6, before the word "Provided", to strike out "\$1,064,140" and insert "\$1,130,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Solicitor," on page 2, line 13, after the word "field", to strike out "\$210,926" and insert "\$220,700."

AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall rise on this floor whenever I am positive that I have unimpeachable evidence to prove that production sabotage is taking place in certain of our aircraft factories under the apparent approval and authorization of Government officials not only at the plants but also in Washington.

This is the ninth time that I have called attention to startling documentary evidence furnished me by aircraft inspectors who have witnessed and testified to the truthfulness of these allegations.

Today I shall substantiate further charges that defective aircraft production is taking place in a number of war plants under the guidance of company as well as Army and Navy authorities.

At this point I refer to the lamentable and un-American methods resorted to by officials—both company and Government—in preventing inspectors from resigning their jobs because they could no longer sanction faulty aircraft material.

I have evidence to prove that the Bell Aircraft Corporation have found it extremely profitable and advantageous to exploit the law of the land in order to club some of their workers into subjection and demoralization.

These corporators have taken advantage of the War Manpower edicts through the medium of forcing their inspectors either to approve defective aircraft or be temporarily without means of making a livelihood. Mr. President, they say, "Either approve or starve." That is what they say to inspectors: "Approve defective airplanes or starve to death."

Those responsible for such tactics must be bitterly criticized and properly punished. This type of stratagem exists only under dictatorships. Such life or death powers have no place in America. The Congress never granted such authority to any individual or corporation. I shall cite the case history of a senior plane inspector who could no longer approve defective production and who is today unemployed because the Bell Aircraft Corporation refuses to grant him a release, and the War Manpower Office at Buffalo, N. Y., declines to grant him a card of availability. He pretended that he was sick in order to be relieved of further factory obligations. He was fearful of losing his self-respect—yes, his very sanity—because Bell Aircraft authorities were using him to rubber stamp dangerously constructed airplanes for sale to the armed forces. He could no longer sleep with his conscience. In protest—in defiance of the Bell Aircraft Corporation—he gave up his job.

He resigned from the Bell Aircraft Corporation on April 30, 1945.

Mr. President, how long is this Congress going to permit this sinister type of wanton murder of our gallant fighting men, not to mention the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars through plane crashes. I am beginning to have grave misgivings as to whether or not we are really fighting this war to save our form of Government, or to retain and perpetuate the basic foundations upon which our Government was founded.

This war is producing many new millionaires, men who are growing rich and self-satisfied. What care they about the boy who lives on the other side of the tracks? What care they about the families of the men who have died in defective planes? What care they about GI Joe?

I now present additional testimony from Mr. Martin J. Green, the senior inspector whom I just mentioned, in which he corroborates similar accusations made by other airplane workers.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand, for any Senator who cares to look at it, the identification badge of Martin J. Green, showing that he is a Government inspector. I also have his photograph number. His identification data reads as follows, as shown by his original factory identification card:

PHOTO 610926

Designation: Senior procurement inspector. Section, central procurement district; branch, inspection; sex, male; age, 39; weight, 214; eyes, blue; hair, brown; date issued, December 22, 1945.

Mr. Green's address is 1375 Michigan Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.

Mr. President, I assert once again that for 24 months the Mead committee has not made a report. The report which we have been promised by that committee with regard to defective airplanes has not been made.

I quote Inspector Green's charges:

I have read the statements sent you by the former inspectors at the Curtiss-Wright plant, and which were published in the Buffalo Evening News. Being an ex-Army inspector, I can truthfully say that conditions such as were described in their statements really existed, because I was stationed there for a few months. My reason for writing this statement is this: If any war plant around here needed, and still needs looking into, it's Bell Aircraft at Niagara Falls, N. Y.

Since 1942, with the exception of a few months that I spent at Curtiss, I was stationed at Bell until I resigned on April 30, 1945. Conditions were and are so bad that I forced myself to resign. I gave my reason as ill health which, to a certain extent, was correct. I was slowly working myself into a nervous break-down, because of work being repeatedly passed over my head, by my superiors. In many cases these jobs that were passed were detrimental to the pilot's and ship's safety. When I submitted my formal resignation my superiors had a suspicion as to my real reason for leaving, so I was denied a release. With the cry all over the Nation for men to go into war industries, I am forced to sit around idling away my time, because one of my superiors decided to have his revenge at my expense.

Just because I could not any longer stand conditions such as I am describing below, and these are only a few:

1. Company inspectors were authorized by our inspector in charge, Herbert H. Howard,

to double-stamp ships in predelivery. One stamp was for Bell, and the other for Army acceptance. In other words, these Bell inspectors could pass anything they wished, good or bad, and we had no say in the matter. After this was cut out, two of these competent Bell inspectors were removed from their positions because of incompetency.

2. One Army inspector, Mr. Rhinehold Johnston, held up the crating of a ship for overseas shipment because the corrosion preventative was not applied properly. The woman who was doing the work deliberately turned the spray gun on this Army inspector and sprayed him with oil, practically from head to foot, because he would not O. K. her job; so what happened? The Army inspector was transferred from the shipping department, and nothing done about the woman. In this case I was told by my supervisor that this Army inspector would have to be moved, because he was too strict.

Too strict about what, Mr. President? Too strict about protecting the lives of our pilots, 17,500 of whom have already died in the United States, 3 times as many pilots as have died on all the fronts of this war.

The Army supervisor who removed Inspector Johnston was Herbert Loesser.

And I gave the name to the Mead committee.

3. One Army inspector named Matthew Lang, who was at that time a lead man on the floor, had words with one of his men, M. J. O'Grady, because this man had during his lunch hour imbibed in a few drinks and was passing work in a hurried manner. Because of this, Inspector Lang was called up on the carpet by the inspector in charge, Herbert Howard. Inspector Lang turned out to be the accused, instead of the accuser. When Inspector Lang threatened that he would go over the head of the inspector in charge, Herbert Howard, he was conveniently transferred to Curtiss. I called him up occasionally and learned that things there at that time were as bad there as they were at Bell.

4. I was assigned to oxygen-equipment inspection at the time the following happened: In checking over two ships that were considered "hot"—in other words, ready to be flown away on this particular morning—in checking the pressure gages I found that the pressures were low, below the required amount. This, then, denoted a leaky condition. Not wanting these ships held up for a recheck of the oxygen systems, I was told by my supervisors, Herbert Loesser and Arthur Bronke, that they had been flown the previous afternoon at high altitudes and oxygen used, and that the flight-line crew had forgotten to refill these systems to the required 425 p. s. i. After the ships were flown away, I checked into the matter and found that these ships weren't off the ground in 3 days. I don't have to mention that oxygen is just as important to a pilot at high altitudes as the engine itself. If for the lack of oxygen, caused by a leak, the pilot should black out, not only the loss of ship is possible but also the loss of his life. Mr. Bronke is now inspector in charge.

5. I was called on to sign a salvage ticket for the repair of a cracked fuselage bulkhead in a ship. The disposition of this repair was not proper, as it was in direct contrast with technical orders covering such repairs. I turned this down—

He refused to pass it—and the job was left over for the next shift, knowing that my supervisor, Herbert Loesser, would accept it just as it was. As in the past, it was O. K'd by him and my original disposition was voided. This bulkhead is a structural member and the repair he O. K'd would not stop it from cracking further in

flight, under stress, causing the aft fuselage to buckle and result in loss of ship and pilot.

In the case of the accident which happened last week within a few miles of Washington, when a plane crashed and four were killed, all we heard was that an investigation would be made at some time in the future. I do not care when they make the investigation, the four Army men will still be dead.

6. In this instance one of my men turned down and ordered the removal of the main oil line. This was because of an indentation in this line of approximately 50 percent, restricting full flow of engine oil. I then backed him up and also turned it down. Because this entailed about 4 hours' work, production left it for the next shift. The supervisor, Herbert Loesser, O. K'd this job "as is." In this instance also this could result in loss of pilot's life and ship because of malfunctioning of the oil system.

7. The present Army inspector in charge, Arthur Bronke, at the airport can be depended upon to stamp out anything that production can't get stamped out by the Army inspector who originally rejected the job. All production had to do is hold these jobs over for his shift, and the job is sold.

8. About 2 months ago word was received that the air inspectors were going to come around and check into things. Immediately all lower classified Army inspectors were taken out of final inspection, and those with higher classifications, such as CAF-8, were moved into their places. These lower grade men were doing this kind of work for as long as I was there, I understand against regulations. But that did not matter, as long as the air inspectors were impressed, while they were there. Mr. Herbert Loesser and Mr. Arthur Bronke were aware of the air inspectors' visit to the plant in advance.

The inspectors notified him, apparently, that they were coming. What kind of an inspection is that?

This information was passed on to me by Mr. Loesser.

I could keep writing on and on about these conditions but this would take too long. I have this to say in closing. If the Army inspectors that are stationed at Bell were interviewed in their homes and in confidence, a lot more could be learned. They are afraid to talk on the job, because of reciprocation.

Mr. President, I submit a list of directors of the Bell Aircraft Corp., 2050 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y. These are the men who could put an immediate stop to the production of defective aircraft. Again I call attention, as I did when I last talked on this subject, when I showed up the men who owned this corporation, that they were making millions and hundreds of millions of dollars by selling defective airplanes which have caused the death in America, according to the Army itself, of 17,500 pilots, while only 5,000 have died on the war fronts. I showed that with the exception of 3, as I remember, these men were connected with Wall Street. These are the names:

Laurence D. Bell, president; director, Sterling Engine Co., Irving Air Chute Co., Niagara Share Corp.

Roy P. Whitman, director, Manufacturers Aircraft Association, Buffalo Chamber of Commerce.

Robert J. Woods.

Charles A. Crique, director, Sterling Engine Co.

This next man is really a director.

J. F. Schoellkopf, Jr., president, Niagara Share Corp.; chairman, Insur-

anshares Certificates, Inc.; director, Buffalo Electro-Chemical Co., Skenandoa Rayon Corp., Forest Petroleum Corp., General Reinsurance Corp., General Railway Signal Co., Republic Steel Corp., Dunlop Tire & Rubber Corp., Buffalo Insurance Co., American Steamship Co., Marine Midland Corp., Niagara Oil Corp.

Ansley W. Sawyer, partner, Dudley, Stowe & Sawyer; president, Wonalancet Co.; director, Ellicott Square Co., Abstract Title & Mortgage Corp., Buffalo Electro-Chemical Co., Great Lakes Transic Co., Terminals & Transportation Corp.

Walter A. Yates, president, Yates Lehigh Coal Co.; vice president, Hotel Lafayette, Vendome Garage, Yates McLaughlin, Inc.; treasurer, Buffalo General Heat, Inc.

John W. deForest, general agent, Aetna Life Insurance Co., Buffalo, N. Y.

Mr. President, with the kind of inspection had in this particular plant, I wonder how many pilots the Aetna Life Insurance Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., would insure?

I can only say that I intend again and again and again to call the attention of the Senate to what is taking place in the plants of airplane manufacturing companies until the time when the former Truman committee, now known as the Mead committee, makes a thorough investigation and makes public the secret data, the report which former Senator Truman, now President of the United States, said 4 months ago on the Senate floor would be presented to the United States Senate.

SUGGESTIONS FOR RELIEVING NEWS-PRINT SHORTAGE IN UNITED STATES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I presume every member of the Senate has been made cognizant of the extremely critical situation which faces the newspaper publishers of the country due to the lack of newsprint, a lack which exists not only among the newspaper publishers but among various departments of government which use considerable quantities of this material. As a newspaperman I have been interested in this subject, and have tried to find some way by which these shortages could be relieved. Of course in all things we have had to yield first place to the war effort. That was the extreme priority in the past few months. However, with the close of the war in Europe it seems to me a situation has arisen which may give some relief to American newspaper publishers. Suggestions have come to me from one of the outstanding newspaper publishers of the State of Indiana, Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star, which I pass along for the information of Members of the Senate and for the information of the various Government agencies which have to do with the control of newsprint:

Herewith is a seven-point program which, if followed, would relieve the newsprint shortage in the United States within the next 90 days:

1. Without further delay, insist that Swedish pulp be shipped into England, Holland, and France, or sent direct to United States and Canadian plants.

Sweden has approximately a million tons of pulp ready for shipment. The problem is to get it into some plant somewhere and have it processed into newsprint. The supply is rationed and when the supply is increased all of us get more newsprint.

2. Stop or drastically curtail newsprint and paper product shipments to the armed forces in Europe. Approximately 30 percent of our newsprint production in the United States and Canada is now going to the armed forces. Sweden and Finland can furnish the pulp for all of these needs and it can be processed in the English and European plants. This is really our greatest need—to have these shipments stopped.

3. Speed up work of clearing out mines in the Norwegian shipping lanes which have been endangering shipments of Swedish pulp.

4. Direct the OPA and WPB to cooperate more generously with Canada in getting increased shipments of pulp and newsprint into the United States. At the present time the Canadian OPA is holding back shipments of timber and pulp to plants in the United States.

5. Transfer at least 20,000 prisoners of war now in this country to the Maine and Northwest woods for the next 90 days to cut timber for pulp. The labor shortage is one of the most serious bottlenecks in this whole newsprint problem.

6. Insist on Canada releasing timber and pulp for processing by United States plants. This is very important.

7. Relax both United States and Canadian restrictions on shipment of newsprint to American newspapers, even though there has to be some readjustment in prices.

I respectfully urge the Members of the Senate to study this proposal and join in an effort to secure relief through the proper agencies.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator from Indiana tell me why we cannot get pulp and timber from Canada with which to produce newsprint for the newspapers of America?

Mr. WILLIS. Shortage of labor has been given as one of the reasons. Another reason assigned is shortage of shipping facilities. However, there is some mystery respecting the restrictions on newsprint coming into this country.

Mr. LANGER. What is the mystery? I know that the small newspaper publishers in North Dakota cannot get newsprint. They have been trying to get it for more than a year. They have been cutting down the size of their papers from eight sheets to four sheets. The newsprint they are able to obtain they secure by going down on their knees and begging for it. Just what is the trouble?

Mr. WILLIS. I am not able to answer the Senator's question categorically or directly, but I know the problem exists among all the newspapers of the country. They have been obliged to cut their output by a considerable percentage, and at the same time to give their efforts to the promotion of the war program.

I find that during 1944 the newspapers of America published 1,555,545 individual advertisements, valued at nearly \$50,000,000, in support of our war effort. There is no better avenue of education than the newspapers. There seems to be a tendency in certain circles to have newsprint taken over by the Govern-

ment instead of giving the newspapers the amount of it they need.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not a fact that pulp and timber are being held by a Canadian trust?

Mr. WILLIS. I cannot answer the Senator's question.

Mr. LANGER. Is it or is it not a fact that some of the newspapers in America own their own pulp plants in Canada and that they have been forced to build pulp plants in that country?

Mr. WILLIS. That is true. They have also been denied shipping facilities with which to move their products out of Canada.

Mr. LANGER. Has any congressional committee been appointed to look into this matter, and has any investigation been made of the subject?

Mr. WILLIS. I do not know of any investigation except by committees of the newspaper publishers themselves. I shall be glad later to submit their findings to the Senate.

PROPOSED CONGRESSIONAL EXPENSE ALLOWANCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as one who strenuously opposed the \$2,500 wage increase for Senators by way of an expense account, I think it is important that we keep the record straight as to the nature of that account.

I note from the press that statements are being issued to the American people that, although the Senate refused the \$2,500 increase, it did, however, vote itself a \$1,500 increase by way of funds for long-distance telephone calls. As a result, I believe that some very misleading interpretations are being made of the action of the Senate. I think the country is entitled to a statement of fact in that connection, and to a clear drawing of the distinction between the Senate appropriation and the proposed \$2,500 expense account appropriation now being considered by the House.

There is a marked difference between the Senate's voting itself an appropriation for the payment of long-distance telephone calls for Government service rendered and voting for an allowance of \$2,500 to be put in the pockets of each Member of the Senate by way of an expense account to pay for meals and lodging of Senators in Washington. One constitutes a wage increase in violation of the stabilization program and the other constitutes payment for Government expenses actually incurred in the performance of Government business.

Further, let me point out that the figure \$1,500 is highly exaggerated. Investigation will show that if the 26 telephone calls a month provided for in the appropriation bill were actually made by each Member of the Senate the amount would fall far short of \$1,500.

Again, I point out that the \$2,500 allowance which we refused to vote ourselves would have constituted a violation of the stabilization program. The \$1,500 for telephone calls, or whatever fraction thereof may be involved—and it will be much less than \$1,500—will not go into the pockets of any Members of the

Senate. It will not be paid out of the Treasury of the United States unless the telephone calls are made in the performance of official business.

I know of no Senator who would object to having the House provide for itself an appropriation for exactly the same service, in the interest of Government business, as that which accrues to the benefit of Senators. I repeat that I believe that the \$2,500 expense allowance would constitute a wage grab in the midst of a war, and in violation of our stabilization program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to undertake to explain the telephone situation so that it may be very clearly understood.

Last year the Senate authorized ten 3-minute telephone conversations a month. It was estimated that the total cost of such calls would be approximately \$25,000 or \$30,000 for the year. An examination will show that for the first 10 months of the fiscal year, up to May 1 of this year, the cost of such calls was between \$7,000 and \$8,000 for the entire Senate; or, computed on the basis of a 12-month period, basing the estimate upon the first 10 months, the cost would be approximately \$100 a year for each Senator.

The bill this year provides not to exceed twenty-six 5-minute calls, or a total of 130 minutes. At the most, the cost would multiply last year's figure by 4, which would mean approximately \$400 for each Senator, which is greatly below the figure which I have heard mentioned, which is based upon imagination rather than actual facts.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much. I obtained practically the same figures today in my investigation.

I repeat that the money would not be paid unless a Senator actually made the calls. I am sure that when I was a member of the War Labor Board I saved the Government many thousands of dollars by being able to call various sections of the country by telephone in regard to Government business—savings which could not have been made if we had had to send men into the field and incur the necessary expenses which would have been entailed in doing the same job which I was able to do over the long-distance telephone in a very few minutes.

So far as I am concerned, I would welcome the opportunity for Members of the House to enjoy the same privilege that Senators enjoy in regard to long-distance telephone calls on Government business. The point I wish to make is that there is a marked difference between a Senator's receiving funds for long-distance telephone calls actually made, and receiving \$2,500 for board and lodging in the midst of the war, when the \$2,500 allowance, no matter how it might be interpreted, would constitute a violation of our stabilization program.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the

Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] a question. How much travel expense is involved in the first amendment, on page 2, line 6, of the bill? I assume that the increase applies only to salaries and that there is no travel expense in that item.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not have the figures at hand at the moment. What the Senator wishes to know is, of the first item in the bill, which is \$1,130,200, what is the total amount for travel in the Office of the Secretary? The Office of the Secretary includes the Secretary's office proper, the Petroleum Conservation Division, Soil and Moisture Conservation Operations, and the development of Alaska. The total is \$225,000.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask him a further question. How much travel expense does the entire bill contain?

Mr. HAYDEN. The estimates were for \$4,995,950. We have reduced that amount somewhat, but not greatly.

Mr. OVERTON. According to the figures contained in the House report, the Budget estimate is \$5,079,110.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. This is practically the same thing. It is \$4,995,950.

Mr. OVERTON. According to the report, the amount actually spent for travel expense in 1944 for the Department of the Interior was \$3,009,090. In 1945 the estimated travel expense leaped up approximately \$700,000, to \$3,767,000. For the coming fiscal year the pending bill provides approximately \$5,000,000 for travel expense, which is an increase of approximately \$1,250,000. I have no objection to the items for travel expense. However, when we had under consideration an amendment to make an allowance for expenditures by Senators in the discharge of their official duty, the total of which would have amounted to between \$240,000 and \$250,000 a year, the argument was made that it would be exceedingly inflationary.

I wish to point out this proposed increase in travel expenditures and the total sum of money now being used by the Department of the Interior for travel purposes in order that Senators may consider this item in the light of the argument which some Senators made when the Senate was considering the appropriation of a comparatively small amount of money for the general expenses of Senators, including travel, maintenance, lodging, and so forth. I am not opposed to the requested appropriation now under consideration; on the contrary, I favored the appropriation for Senators and I favor this appropriation for the Department of the Interior. But if an appropriation of two-hundred-and-forty-odd thousand dollars would be inflationary, certainly the appropriation of five million and some-odd thousand dollars is very inflationary, and certainly an increase of \$1,250,000 in the appropriation for one department for travel purposes during 1 year would be considered by some of the Senators, I am sure, as being extremely inflationary. I hope they will not make

that argument against this item. I think these requested appropriations for travel expenses should be allowed. I voted for them in the committee, and I shall vote for them on the floor of the Senate; but I notice that some Senators are now very much interested in the item, and I think it is my duty as a member of the committee to call their attention to what we have done.

There is also in the bill another provision to which I think attention should be called. The House of Representatives undertook to limit by \$150,000 the amounts of money which could be expended for telephone, telegraph, and cablegram messages. I think that item is to be found in section 8, on page 115. The bill as passed by the House provides that not to exceed \$80,000 shall be available for long-distance telephone calls, and not to exceed \$70,000 for telegrams and cablegrams. There is a total limitation of \$150,000. In the committee we voted to strike out that limitation, so that there would be no limitation at all on expenditures for communications by the Department of the Interior. Last year there was a corresponding limitation of \$40,000 for telephone calls and \$40,000 for telegrams and cablegrams.

Mr. President, I am simply calling attention to the amendment which was voted by the Committee on Appropriations. In the committee I voted for the amendment, and I am in favor of it. I do not think there should be any limitation on the expenditures for necessary communications. Let the Department spend what may be necessary in order effectively to discharge the duties of their office. However, I point out that there may be some inconsistency between voting for such an allowance and the votes which certain Senators cast in regard to the proposed expense allowance for Senators.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In view of the fact that the Senator has spoken of an inconsistency, let me point out that the other day after the Senate discussed the so-called Senators' expense account item, and after that proposed allowance had been rejected following a loud hue and cry from all over the Senate about what a violation it would be of the Little Steel Formula of 15 percent, many Senators who had just voted against the proposed allowance for Senators voted, when the next item was under consideration, to increase the pay of the pages from \$4 to \$5, or a 25-percent increase. I think as much of the pages as does any other Senator, but it seemed to me to be a very inconsistent move at that time, and I was interested to see some of the Senators who had argued the loudest and the longest about observance of the Little Steel formula and the 15-percent rule vote "yea" when the vote was taken on the proposed 25-percent increase in the pay of the Senate pages. I wish to say that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] voted "nay" and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] also voted "nay." I know he did, because I watched him. So they were consistent, and I shall pay that tribute to any other Sen-

ator who was consistent in the votes he cast at that time.

However, I think that it is not at all consistent today, in connection with the pending appropriation bill, for Senators to vote to increase the appropriation for travel expense money under the pending bill to \$5,000,000 a year in the middle of the war.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Merely to keep the record straight in regard to the pay items, but not to enter into detail regarding them, I think it is necessary to look into the facts of the cases when they arise. When the pay of the pages was increased from \$4 to \$5 it was increased to precisely the same amount which is to be paid the pages in the House of Representatives. But, more than that, the pages receive no mileage, and they are required to pay for their own school tuition, and most of them live away from home and have expenses in that connection. I think the increase in the pay of the pages is justified on its merits, in view of the facts of their situation, no matter what the other situation may be.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am not quarreling about the increase made in the pay of the pages. I am glad to see them here, and I am in favor of paying them as much as the pages in the House of Representatives are paid, but I point out that there is no consistency between the votes of some Senators on that item and their votes on the question of the allowance of expense money for Senators. However, I wish to say that I admire our pages, and I wish to have them properly paid and properly treated in every way.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's statement, and his argument is absolutely correct. It is said that it is not inflationary to increase the salary of pages 25 percent, but that it is most inflationary to make a 25-percent increase in the income of Senators. That is just what the amendment suggested by the Appropriations Committee would have done; it would have increased the compensation or the income of Senators by 25 percent.

This amendment, which was almost unanimously adopted for the benefit of the pages did increase their compensation 25 percent. So we break the Little Steel formula when we wish to do so, and we anchor it when we wish to do so, and it does not make a particle of difference. I have no doubt that we are about to increase the allowance for travel expenses of one department of the Government by considerably more than a million dollars, and that we will roll the total up to more than \$5,000,000; but, of course, there is nothing inflationary in that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The reason for the rejection of the proposed allowance for Senators, the other day, was that the Senators are not worth it, whereas the pages are! That was the distinction; was it not? [Laughter.]

Mr. BURTON. No, Mr. President; if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that no inference whatsoever is to be drawn in relation to the arguments for increased senatorial compensation. I am arguing for the increase in the compensation of pages on its own merits.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether I am correct in my understanding that the reason advanced for the proposed increased amount of travel allowance is that it will pay for travel which does not now take place; in other words, the department concerned requires an extension of its work, which will necessitate more traveling than is now being done. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator can judge of that as well as I can. All I know about the matter is that the item would increase the travel expense allowance from \$3,700,000 to \$5,000,000.

Mr. MORSE. Let me ask the Senator from Arizona what his understanding is about the matter. Suppose Mr. X in the past has taken certain trips from Washington to Denver, Colo., let us say. Is it now proposed that Mr. X shall get more money, to enable him to make more trips from Washington to Denver, or is it proposed that under the new program of the department Y and Z may be required to take trips to Minneapolis or to Portland?

Mr. HAYDEN. The latter assumption is correct. For the fiscal year 1944 the total amount available to the Department of the Interior was approximately \$113,000,000, including overtime. The Budget estimate this year was approximately \$141,000,000. It is expected that more work will be done in the field. When it is done, more travel will be necessary.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I thought the item related to. I may say that there is nothing inflationary, under the policy of the Government, in money being paid for service not previously rendered. The problem is to prevent increases in pay for the same service which was rendered as of September 15, 1942. That is the basis of the Government's anti-inflation program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, in line 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I rise to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question. On page 6 of the bill in connection with the Bonneville Power Administrator there is an item which provides the sum of approximately \$21,000 for personal services within the District of Columbia. The language to which I refer reads: "including not to exceed \$20,850 for personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; and purchase (not exceeding 30), maintenance, and operation of passenger automobiles", and so forth. What does the Bonneville Power Administrator have to do with the use of automobiles within the District of Columbia?

Mr. HAYDEN. Nothing. The language refers to the use of automobiles in the field. The provision to which the Senator refers is merely a limitation upon the

amount of money which may be spent within the District of Columbia. In the same paragraph there is an authorization for partial surveys of certain transmission lines. The authorization is broken down and separated by semicolons.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I also note the words, "hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$3,500,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. The appropriation mentioned covers the entire item. The authorization to use aircraft is required by a recent act of Congress. If it is necessary to use a plane in order to travel to some point, it may be used. There was a provision placed in the independent offices bill to this effect:

SEC. 203. Excepting appropriations for the military and naval establishments, no appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in this or any other act shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, or operation of any aircraft unless specific authority for the purchase, maintenance, or operation thereof has been or is provided in such appropriation, and the acquisition of aircraft by any agency by transfer from another agency of the Government shall be considered as a purchase within the meaning hereof.

So the words to which reference has been made must be inserted in the bill. Otherwise not a cent could be used for hiring an airplane to travel anywhere.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the appropriation of \$3,500,000 is for personal service, such as hiring the use of aircraft, and all things of that nature.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is for construction, operation, and maintenance, and so forth. It covers all the items in the paragraph. The items are separated, as the Senator will note, by semicolons.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In that connection I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Washington to page 71 of the bill, line 19. The language there reads:

Mineral resources of Alaska: For investigation of the mineral resources of Alaska, \$232,500, to be available immediately, of which not to exceed \$85,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Roughly speaking, that means that one-third of the entire appropriation may be spent in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is because the geologist works all summer in Alaska gathering his data and comes back to Washington where he prepares his report. That process has been followed since the establishment of the Geological Survey. The men do not stay in the field and write their reports. The law requires, however, that if a man be employed in the District of Columbia, that portion of the money which is to be used to compensate him must be earmarked for the District. I have to make that explanation almost every year in respect to geological surveys because many persons cannot understand why such a large appropriation of money is made available for expenditure in the District. The Senator can well understand that when a surveying party goes out into the field they make their field notes while on the trip, but must work them up later, and

the best place to do it is in Washington, where they have their reference books and all the equipment necessary in preparing reports of that character.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on page 26, in line 5, I notice the following paragraph:

Miscellaneous projects, \$40,000; Arizona: Ak Chin, \$4,000; Chiu Chui, \$4,000; Fort Apache, \$4,500; San Carlos, \$5,000; Navajo, miscellaneous projects, Arizona and New Mexico, \$41,535; together with \$25,500 (Fruitlands, \$9,000; Ganado, \$1,500; Hogback, \$7,000; miscellaneous projects, \$8,000), collections; Hopi, miscellaneous projects, \$1,500; San Xavier, \$2,000; Truxton Canon, \$1,815; Salt River, \$3,400, together with \$2,600, collections; California: Mission, \$7,000, together with \$3,000 (Morongo, \$1,000; Pala and Rincon, \$1,000; miscellaneous projects, \$1,000), collections; Colorado: Southern Ute, \$8,000, together with—

Mr. HAYDEN. The amounts which the Senator has been reading are for maintenance and operation costs of projects which already exist.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that they are all located in States other than North Dakota. [Laughter.]

I am very curious to know why. The Standing Rock Reservation, one of the largest in the United States, does not have a single project.

Mr. HAYDEN. Are there any small rivers in the State of North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. We have the Missouri River for nearly 100 miles. It flows adjacent to the Standing Rock Indian Reservation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Most of the projects which the Senator read have been developed on Indian land along small streams.

Mr. LANGER. In connection with the Missouri River project, we have six or eight small rivers flowing through the Standing Rock Indian Reservation. We do not have a single Indian reservation project in the State of North Dakota. It seems to me that that is the rankest kind of discrimination in the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should point out to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that in another place in the bill there is an item authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with its preliminary studies under the Missouri River plan, to the adoption of which the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation last year contributed its efforts when it cooperated with the Committee on Commerce in connection with the flood-control bill which was handled on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. The flood-control bill, which was enacted last fall, contained the basic statutory authorization for the development of projects on the Missouri River. Without the statutory authorization it would be impossible, of course, for the Committee on Appropriations to put any items in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming I may

say that only yesterday I received from the Bureau of Reclamation a beautiful map in six or seven colors. I do not have the slightest doubt that the Senator from Wyoming received a similar map. If the Senator will look at that map he will see that there is not one single development of an Indian reservation in either North Dakota or South Dakota.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No proposal of the kind was made to the legislative committee which was studying the authorization for the development of the river.

Mr. LANGER. I naturally assumed that the distinguished Senator, being chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, would bring this matter to the attention of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs of which I am a member. Until I saw the item on my desk today I did not know that the Committee on Appropriations had considered it.

When a whole body of projects is being provided for in New Mexico, Arizona, and many other States, our Indians in North Dakota should have a chance to do a little work and earn a little money.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is overlooking the fact that this whole matter was under discussion in the Senate a year ago, long before the present speaker became chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, and that was the time when it was incumbent upon any Senator who desired to expand the work to draw it to the attention of the legislative committee which was providing the basic authority, without which the Committee on Appropriations cannot act.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say, in reply to the Senator, that at the very time I was on the floor taking up the matter of streams flowing into the Missouri River. The situation is similar to that when there was passed, under the sponsorship of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], a bill providing \$15,000,000 for flood control. We had had all kinds of floods in North Dakota, but when that \$15,000,000 was expended, it was all expended in Indiana, Illinois, and the others of the five particular States named, although at that time I called to the attention of the Senate the fact that our farmers in the Dakotas had suffered from a serious flood.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will turn to page 68, line 12—

Mr. LANGER. Is that the \$8,000 item?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, \$4,680,000 for the Missouri River Basin. That will take care not only of the Indians, if the project is found feasible, but other projects which might be necessary, and under the jurisdiction of other agencies.

Mr. LANGER. I might add that the \$4,000,000 provided on page 68 has nothing at all to do with our Indian reservations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it has. It says "existing Federal and State agencies". The Office of Indian Affairs is a Federal agency, and of course it will have to develop the projects. Naturally I believe the Senator is correct in saying the Indians should have something, but so far as the Committee on Appropriations

is concerned, all we can do is to recommend the appropriation of the money to do the work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that all this money is for investigations, and a large part of the amount will be used by the Geological Survey. But \$58,500 is to be made available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the Missouri River Basin work, to study the possibility of irrigation on Indian reservations.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me call to the attention of the Senate the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, on which there are approximately 5,000 Indians. Let me first ask the Senator if the consideration of the bill is to be concluded today.

Mr. HAYDEN. It will be impossible to conclude the consideration of the bill today.

Mr. LANGER. Before we finish the bill, I certainly wish to call attention to the report prepared by former Gov. John Moses, which showed that about 4 or 5 years ago, of the 5,000 Indians, roughly, on Turtle Mountain Reservation, 90 percent were on relief; 90 percent did not have a thing to do upon the reservation; they had no work and were destitute. Yet, in this bill, there is not one word, so far as I know, about those Indians. I should like to have the Indian Office suggest some kind of an amendment which would enable those Indians to have some kind of occupation.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee would be very glad to consider an amendment of that kind, if the Senator from North Dakota will get some data on which we may sustain it in conference with the House. It would not do much good to put it in the bill without some supporting data. Can the Senator do that overnight?

Mr. LANGER. I think I can.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely rise to compliment the Senator from Arizona and the subcommittee for increasing the House appropriation for the Columbia Basin project by \$2,332,000. I hope the Senate will insist on keeping that amount in the bill, because at a recent meeting of all those involved in the great Columbia Basin project in my State, it was decided, because of the trend of the war since the House considered this matter, that the program should be expedited and the Columbia Basin project begun as soon as possible. Originally a 20-year plan was contemplated; the time has been cut; and possibly we will get it down to 10 or 12 years, so that in due course some irrigated farms may be provided for war veterans and other persons in the States of Washington and Oregon who will probably be left there when the war is over. Our State has increased in population about 18 percent. Conservatively estimated, we will have approximately 300,000 to 400,000 people out of work. This project will not only furnish them work, but it will furnish them with a place to live.

Of the increase restored by the Senate committee, \$2,000,000 is for the purchase of land. Many do not understand what is meant by that provision. It is merely to allow the Bureau of Reclamation, in the Department of the Interior, in connection with the Columbia River Basin project, to buy up lands in tracts in excess of 160 acres which might be used for speculation when the project is developed, to hold it in a kind of trusteeship, so that it can be disposed of in smaller tracts for settlers on the land.

I wish to compliment the committee, and I know the people in my State and in the Pacific Northwest generally are eternally grateful to the committee for restoring this amount, which will mean building a new empire in the West.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a statement I have prepared regarding this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill as it passed the House, I call attention particularly to three items in which the State of Washington is very much interested. These are:

The restoration of the full amount of the budget estimate of \$8,332,000, which was reduced to \$6,000,000 in the House bill, is requested for the Columbia Basin project. These funds were to be used for the following purposes:

Dam and power plant.....	\$1,500,000
Spillway reconditioning.....	2,632,000
Irrigation system (preconstruction).....	2,000,000
Land-purchase program.....	2,000,000
Examination and surveys.....	200,000
Total.....	8,332,000

Of course there should be no question about the need for any of the funds as listed. The war conditions have changed materially since the bill was considered by the House committee and passed by the House of Representatives and the funds recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for postwar activities are even more urgently needed now than they were when proposed by the Bureau of the Budget. The continuation of work on the dam and power plant and spillway reconditioning is, of course, current work that must be carried on. The two major items essential to postwar preparation for the Columbia Basin project are the \$2,000,000 for preconstruction work on the irrigation system and \$2,000,000 for the initiation of the land-purchase program.

Several months ago I attended a conference at the invitation of the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Bashore, at which the Regional Director, Mr. Banks, and his staff, who are in charge of the Columbia Basin work, were present. I expressed the opinion that the Congress was intensely interested in developing the irrigation features of the project and that the Bureau of Reclamation should be prepared to carry forward an expedited construction program.

In order to be prepared for this program, it is necessary that the Bureau have funds for the preparation of designs and specifications for the pumping plant, balancing reservoir, and main canal, and other irrigation features. Simultaneously the Bureau should also be prepared to purchase land in excess of farm units of 160 acres in order that speculation may be prevented.

All of this work is in the interest of jobs for returning servicemen and demobilized

civilian war workers in the Pacific Northwest and in having available, as soon as practicable, irrigated land for the settlement of veterans and qualified civilians.

The population of Washington State has increased 18.4 percent in the last 4 years and jobs are going to be necessary for a considerable number of these newcomers to the Pacific Northwest. In addition to that nearly 200,000 veterans are expected to return from the wars.

The second item to which I call attention is the budget estimate of \$350,000 for continuation of construction of the Roza Division of the Yakima project. This estimate was reduced to \$300,000 by the House, and the full amount is needed to carry out the war food program.

The third item which I stress is one that is of concern to the entire West, that is, the urgency of adequate funds for the Bureau of Reclamation to be prepared to start construction on irrigation and multiple-purpose projects to provide employment on construction and permanent settlement opportunities of the irrigated land in the 17 Western States. The Bureau of the Budget estimated \$5,500,000 for general investigations and preconstruction work on authorized projects. I shall not go into the history of the reduction of this amount to \$125,000 except to point out the gross inadequacy of the latter amount.

The Bureau of Reclamation is completing wide reports on the Columbia River and some 14 other river systems of the West. From these reports feasible projects will be presented which will require additional funds to complete field investigations. As a result of previous appropriations, the Bureau is prepared to start plans and specifications for other projects so that work can begin promptly when war conditions require employment for returning servicemen and demobilized civilian workers.

I hope serious consideration will be given not only to these items but to other budget estimates for the Bureau of Reclamation which were reduced in the House bill. It occurs to me also that Senators may wish to consider that the conditions due to the favorable turn of the war are conducive to an even enlarged reclamation program throughout the West.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I notice the following in the report on the bill, on page 10:

General support and rehabilitation of needy Indians: The committee recommend that the following language be stricken from the bill: "not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available for the rehabilitation of needy Indians."

Will the Senator from Arizona explain why that was eliminated?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because if we remove the limitation, more Indians can be taken care of.

Mr. LANGER. The committee strikes out the \$40,000 item?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. That was a limitation placed in the bill by the House, and we thought it was too low. The representations made to us were that the sums of money authorized by the House were wholly and utterly inadequate to take care of the needy Indians. So we increased the amount and removed the limitation.

Mr. LANGER. How much is now available, with the limitation removed?

Mr. HAYDEN. \$739,700 is available, which is considerably above the amount allowed by the House.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of territories and island possessions," on page 2, line 16, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$112,440" and insert "\$142,920."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Petroleum Conservation Division," on page 3, line 2, after the word "vehicles," to strike out "\$173,212" and insert "\$195,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious we cannot conclude the bill today. It had been my hope that we might dispose of all the amendments except the one which is controversial, the one pertaining to California. It probably will be necessary to have a session tomorrow, and if the Senator from Arizona is willing to suspend now, we might as well do so, because we cannot conclude the consideration of the bill today.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Several assistant surgeons and passed assistant surgeons for appointment in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Commerce:

Sundry employees for promotion in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Austin S. Imrie for appointment as an administrative officer, national headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of law; and

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

NOMINATION OF CLINTON P. ANDERSON TO BE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report favorably the nomination of Representative Clinton P. Anderson to be Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and placed on the calendar.

NOMINATIONS OF GRADUATES OF COAST GUARD ACADEMY REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report favorably the nominations of cadet graduates of the Coast Guard Academy to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, taking rank from the 6th day of June. This is an urgent matter, and I ask unanimous consent that the nominations may be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I did not hear what the Senator said. As I understand, he has reported nominations of graduates of the Coast Guard Academy, and he asks that the nominations be confirmed.

Mr. BILBO. The statement of the Senator from Maine is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi that the nominations reported by him be confirmed at this time? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER—NOMINATION PREVIOUSLY PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward J. Blackall to be postmaster at Fort Edward, N. Y.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has received a letter from the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] asking that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and, without objection, the nomination is so recommitted.

SECRETARY OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lewis B. Schwellenbach, of Washington, to be Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sam M. Wear, of Missouri, to be United States Attorney for the western district of Missouri.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roscoe F. Good to be rear admiral, to rank from September 22, 1943.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

POSTMASTER, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads today has reported the nomination of Guy R. Lucas to be postmaster at Cleveland, Ohio. I may point out that we have had an acting postmaster in Cleveland for many months, a man from outside the State of Ohio. We are anxious to proceed today with action on this nominee, as to whom there is no controversy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination may be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Guy R. Lucas to be postmaster at Cleveland, Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BURTON. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate, in legislative session, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose in a moment to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. There is one item in the bill pertaining to the central power project in California which is controversial, and I understand from the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that he wishes to delay consideration of that item until the return of the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. If the Senator from California is present tomorrow we will conclude action on that item, otherwise it will probably have to go over until Monday. If we can finish all other amendments to the bill tomorrow it will be my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess until Monday, and leave that item for consideration then. If the Senator from California is present tomorrow we may be able to conclude the whole bill.

TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS OF ALASKA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to calendar No. 308, House bill 1804, to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska," approved June 5, 1942. I intend to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill. The bill was approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

The amendment is merely an extension of the time within which a jurisdictional claim may be filed on behalf of these Indians. The time will expire on the 5th of June next if the bill is not enacted into law. The bill has already passed the House. There is no controversy over the matter. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of this measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1804) to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska," approved June 5, 1942, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 31, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William D. Pawley, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Oscar B. Ryder, of Virginia, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1951. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Nelson Lee Smith, of New Hampshire, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1950. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

Gordon A. Needham, Kellogg, Idaho, in place of A. T. Combs, retired.

Eva H. Bubon, Alpha, Ill., in place of R. A. Nelson, transferred.

Elizabeth Romer, Northfield, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rose B. Cecil, Great Mills, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Carl O. Sandberg, Glen Lake, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Enid M. Morgan, Rosalie, Nebr., in place of S. J. Anderson, resigned.

Guy R. Lucas, Cleveland, Ohio, in place of J. L. Collins, retired.

Gwyneth Field, Alexandria, S. Dak., in place of W. C. McCaffrey, deceased.

Lela Grace Wilson, Harrison, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Claude A. Reynolds, Meadows of Dan, Va., in place of R. H. Underwood, resigned.

Pauline M. Alvis, Ceredo, W. Va., in place of N. G. Marcum, resigned.

Mary Mariano, Dehue, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 31, 1945:

SECRETARY OF LABOR

Lewis B. Schwellenbach to be Secretary of Labor.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Sam M. Wear to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Roscoe F. Good to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from September 22, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

TO BE ENSIGNS IN THE COAST GUARD, TO RANK FROM THE 6TH DAY OF JUNE 1945

Frank Charles Anderson
James Einar Anderson
William DeForest Ball, Jr.
William Raymond Banks
Winford Welborn Barrow
John Joseph Barry
Glenn Carroll Bartoo
Donald Joseph Benolken
Charles William Berkman
Hobart Millard Bird
Meindert Peter Boon
Gerald Graham Brown, Jr.
Samuel Thomas Brown, Jr.
William Charles Brown
Mario Joseph Cataffo
Philip Norman Chance
Christopher Stephen Changaris
Douglas Hoyt Clifton
William Jacob Cloues 2d
Hubert Wilbur Cocklin
James Arthur Dillian
William George Donaldson
Morgan Lee Dring
William Davidson Ebright
Martin William Flesh
James Alexander Ford
David Daniel Fritts
Walter Richard Goat
Leslie MacLachlan Greig
Ralph Eldon Grosjean
William Allen Gross, Jr.
Robert Raymond Hagan, Jr.
Carl Finley Hanna, Jr.
Paul Anthony Hansen
Oliver Willard Harrison
Bruce Donald Hartel
Robert Joseph Healy
James Charles Heffernan
Spencer Maltby Higley
Philip Merrill Hildebrandt
James Joseph Hill, Jr.
Clarence Richard Howard
James Richard Iversen
Robert Leslie Kallin
Harry James Kolkebeck
Frederic Newcomb Lattin
Sam Anthony Lombardo
Robert Burney Long, Jr.
Charles William Lotz
Herbert James Lynch
Jack Drage Lyon
Jesse Gilbert Magee, Jr.
Risto Antero Mattila
Eugene Edward McCrory
Edward Perry McMahon
Julian Paul Mendelsohn
George William Miller
Mark Fowles Mitchell
James Hamilton Bates Morton
Kevin Leo Moser
Laurence Milton Newkirk
Ralph Winge Niesz
Charles Husler Nixon
John Paul Obarski
Joseph Brian O'Hara
Allen Childress Pearce
Clifford Francis Peistrup
David Claffin Porter
Robert Ira Price
Robert Naylor Rea
George Thomas Richardson
Edgar Clark Ritchie
Casimir Stephen Rojeski
David Robertson Rondstedt

Stanley Bruce Russell
William Oscar Schach
Norman Lee Scherer
Stanley Schilling
Jack Wilbur Schwarze
Robert George Schwing
Willis Neil Seehorn
Abe Harold Siemens
Reuel Floyd Stratton
Peter Alexander Thistle
Francis Andrew Tubeck
Donald Eugene Ullery
Carl William Vogelsang, Jr.
David Carl Walker
Alvin Norman Ward
Paul William Welker
Marc Welliver 2d
Robert Erving Williams
Leslie John Williamson
Francis Calvin Wilson
James MacQuaid Wilson
Robert Douglas Winship
Robert Arnold Worsing

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

James Chester Bowman, Desert Hot Springs.

Jesse A. Coil, Lockeford.

COLORADO

Nell B. Daulton, Ignacio.

Irene B. McClain, Manzanola.

GEORGIA

Elizabeth C. Brock, Adairsville.

E. Vivian Harris, Winder.

INDIANA

Ruth S. Roberts, La Fontaine.

IOWA

Ruth C. Ratliff, Lynnville.

KANSAS

Samuel A. Dennis, Neosho Falls.

MAINE

William L. Jordan, West Peru.

NEBRASKA

Jessie McMillan, Fort Calhoun.

Kenneth C. Baugh, Oakland.

Ella Gertrude Brune, Tekamah.

NEW YORK

Orrin B. Brockway, Hobart.

NORTH CAROLINA

Betty S. Meliski, Chimney Rock.

Verdie Davenport, Deep Run.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ischem G. Williams, Dunseith.

OHIO

Floyd Turner, Barnesville.

Guy R. Lucas, Cleveland.

Loffa C. Hoke, Phillipsburg.

Anna M. Carpenter, Radnor.

John A. Ressler, Verona.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Pauline E. Harmon, Myers.

VIRGINIA

Milton L. Gladstone, Exmore.

WEST VIRGINIA

Goldie M. Farmer, Anmoore.

C. Leslie Hall, Morgantown.

William Wheeler Green, Richwood.

John M. Herold, Webster Springs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bartholomew Snella, O. M. C., member of the Franciscan Fathers Minor Conventuals and of St. Josaphat's Basilica, Milwaukee, Wis., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Let us pray:

O Lord, we are gathered here in the Nation's Capitol to start another day of deliberations for the welfare of our country. We humbly beg Thee that our deliberations may be for God and country, and ever mindful that the blessings of heaven come to those who pray and plead their cause at the foot of Thy throne.

We give thanks to Thee, O Lord, for the privilege of living in a country that allows us to honor and respect Thy name, whose name is above every name, and where we can love thy neighbor as thyself.

O immaculate heart of Mary, queen of heaven and earth and tender mother of men, reign over us and teach us how to make the heart of Jesus reign and triumph in us and around us.

We want to call down upon our country and the whole world the peace of God in justice and charity. Keep this country of ours faithful to its motto, In God We Trust.

Keep our President an upright man, such as cannot be made by clothing, such as cannot be made by wealth, but which is made only by building upon the foundation of Christian faith and upon a large and loving heart. Use our President as your instrument for bringing about peace to this sick and war-torn world that has revolted against You.

Bless our Congress most abundantly, because their problems are many and most difficult. Uphold in them the firm belief in the ultimate triumph of good over evil. Inspire them to think, to speak, and to act according to Thy will. Bless our families, united or separated by the ravages of war; may their homes become Your sanctuaries of love and devotion.

Comfort our Gold Star Mothers who have sacrificed that which was most dear to them—their brave sons.

Let us bow our heads in deep reverence and silent prayer for those brave fathers, sons, brothers, and sisters who have already gone for their eternal reward, sacrificing all, even life itself, for God and country. For those who, at this moment, may be giving up their lives on some distant battlefield, send to them Your angel, so he may comfort them in their last agony.

They are fighting, they are dying, and are willing to do all this to protect those freedoms which we enjoy and to allow us to honor and respect Thy name according to the dictates of our conscience.

O Lord Jesus Christ, who, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, hast not ceased to govern all created things, we pray Thee in behalf of Your children in distant lands who are praying, "Give us this day our daily bread," are deprived of this earthly bread and are hungry for Thy sacrifice and sacraments. We promise to help them in their sustenance of life and send them also Your ministers to help rebuild their bodies and souls. Grant us, O Lord, through the intercession of our most gracious Virgin Mary, perseverance in laboring accord-

ing to Thy will, that the people serving Thee may be augmented in number and merit, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of Little Rock, Ark.

OPA AND FEATHER PILLOWS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration has become well known for its ridiculous orders. There was the one that provided that feeders of steers should retain a percentage of their herds for breeding purposes. Now comes another honey. It is contained in MPR 584 and provides that all retailers of feather and down pillows must send one pillow of each grade which they have in stock on June 27 to the OPA's Durable Goods Branch, Washington 25, D. C.

While the OPA states that this is necessary in order that they may determine the proper price to be charged for each pillow, I am wondering how such a deluge of pillows on Washington is to be handled. Possibly this procedure will make possible the paving of our Washington streets with pillows to assure soft spots on which some of these bureaucrats can land when the Nation finally gets fed up and demands that they be thrown out. Such orders as this, Mr. Speaker, have all the earmarks of being the result of made work to justify the existence of hundreds who are occupying unnecessary jobs in the Government today.

It might not be out of order to inquire if the persons responsible for such an order have consulted with the Office of Defense Transportation and ascertained whether the trips of these pillows are necessary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "War Weariness," by Malvina Lindsay, which appeared in the Washington Post of May 9.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address recently made by Archbishop Cushing, of Boston. It exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing. I am advised that this will cost \$156. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Ernest Lindley.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

TERMINATION OF POWER TO ISSUE CERTAIN CURRENCY

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the vote on H. R. 3000, to amend section 11 (c) and 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill H. R. 3000.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 510) to amend sections 11 (c) and 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H. R. 3000.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by changing the first sentence of such paragraph to read as follows:

"Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation: *Provided, however,* That when the Federal Reserve agent holds gold certificates as collateral for Federal Reserve notes issued to the bank such gold certificates shall be counted as part of the reserve which such bank is required to maintain against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(b) The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by striking therefrom the words "40 percent reserve hereinbefore required" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "25 percent reserve hereinbefore required to be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To suspend for a period not exceeding 30 days, and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding 15 days, any reserve requirements specified in this act: *Provided,* That it shall establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the reserve requirements of this act may be permitted to fall below the level hereinafter specified: *And provided further,* That when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes

falls below 25 percent, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish a graduated tax of not more than 1 percent per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 20 percent, and when said reserve falls below 20 percent, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ percent per annum upon each 2½ percent or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 20 percent. The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

SEC. 2. The second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Any Federal Reserve bank may make application to the local Federal Reserve agent for such amount of the Federal Reserve notes hereinbefore provided for as it may require. Such application shall be accompanied with a tender to the local Federal Reserve agent of collateral in amount equal to the sum of the Federal Reserve notes thus applied for and issued pursuant to such application. The collateral security thus offered shall be notes, drafts, bills of exchange, or acceptances acquired under the provisions of section 13 of this act, or bills of exchange endorsed by a member bank of any Federal Reserve district and purchased under the provisions of section 14 of this act, or bankers' acceptances purchased under the provisions of said section 14, or gold certificates, or direct obligations of the United States. In no event shall such collateral security be less than the amount of Federal Reserve notes applied for. The Federal Reserve agent shall each day notify the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of all issues and withdrawals of Federal Reserve notes to and by the Federal Reserve bank to which he is accredited. The said Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may at any time call upon a Federal Reserve bank for additional security to protect the Federal Reserve notes issued to it."

SEC. 3. All power and authority with respect to the issuance of circulating notes, known as Federal Reserve bank notes, pursuant to the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended by section 401 of the act approved March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1, 6), shall cease and terminate on the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. All power and authority of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury under section 43 (b) (1) of the act approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 31, 52), with respect to the issuance of United States notes, shall cease and terminate on the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by changing the first sentence of such paragraph to read as follows:

"Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation: *Provided, however,* That when the Federal Reserve agent holds gold certificates as collateral for Federal Reserve notes issued to the bank such gold certificates shall be counted as part of the reserve which such bank is required to maintain against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(b) The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by striking therefrom '40 percent reserve hereinbefore required' and by inserting in lieu thereof '25 percent reserve hereinbefore required to

be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

"(c) Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To suspend for a period not exceeding 30 days, and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding 15 days, any reserve requirements specified in this act: *Provided,* That it shall establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the reserve requirements of this act may be permitted to fall below the level hereinafter specified: *And provided further,* That when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 25 percent, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish a graduated tax of not more than 1 percent per annum upon such deficiency until the reserve falls to 20 percent, and when said reserve falls below 20 percent, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ percent per annum upon each 2½ percent or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 20 percent. The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

SEC. 2. The second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Any Federal Reserve bank may make application to the local Federal Reserve agent for such amount of the Federal Reserve notes hereinbefore provided for as it may require. Such application shall be accompanied with a tender to the local Federal Reserve agent of collateral in amount equal to the sum of the Federal Reserve notes thus applied for and issued pursuant to such application. The collateral security thus offered shall be notes, drafts, bills of exchange, or acceptances acquired under the provisions of section 13 of this act, or bills of exchange endorsed by a member bank of any Federal Reserve district and purchased under the provisions of section 14 of this act, or bankers' acceptances purchased under the provisions of said section 14, or gold certificates, or direct obligations of the United States. In no event shall such collateral security be less than the amount of Federal Reserve notes applied for. The Federal Reserve agent shall each day notify the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of all issues and withdrawals of Federal Reserve notes to and by the Federal Reserve bank to which he is accredited. The said Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may at any time call upon a Federal Reserve bank for additional security to protect the Federal Reserve notes issued to it."

SEC. 3. All power and authority with respect to the issuance of circulating notes, known as Federal Reserve bank notes, pursuant to the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended by section 401 of the act approved March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1, 6), shall cease and terminate on the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. All power and authority of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury under section 43 (b) (1) of the act approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 31, 52), with respect to the issuance of United States notes, shall cease and terminate on the date of enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 3000 was passed were vocated, and the bill was laid upon the table.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3109, an act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I reserve my objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the gentleman that there is nothing in this bill now in controversy whatsoever except some raises in the Senate part of the bill. If the gentleman persists in his objection it simply means that we shall have to get a rule. Nothing else is in controversy. It seems to me it is unnecessary to tax the gentleman's colleagues by forcing them to go through that procedure. Everything in the bill itself is in agreement except these few amendments and it is only a question, it seems to me, of further harassing the colleagues to get a show-down on matters not in dispute.

I do not think the gentleman is accomplishing anything.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I understand the situation and I still object.

EROSION STUDY OF LAKE ERIE SHORE LINE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 630) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 230) authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 16, 1942, on a cooperative beach erosion study of the Lake Erie shore line in the vicinity of Huron, Ohio, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with illustrations, as a House document, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter of the Secretary of War, transmitted to the House of Representatives on March 23, 1943, including a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 16, 1942, with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach-erosion study of the Lake Erie shore line in the vicinity of Huron, Ohio, made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, and an act approved on June 26, 1936, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with illustrations, as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report a privileged resolution (H. Res. 277, Rept. No. 632) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the proceedings held in the House of Representatives on April 24, 1945, in commemoration of Pan-American Day, be printed as a House document and then 15,000

additional copies be printed for the use of the House document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report a privileged resolution (H. Res. 276, Rept. No. 631) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the addresses delivered in the House of Representatives on May 3, 1945, on the one hundred fifty-fourth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution be printed as a House document, and that 15,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the House document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two short editorials.

WHISKY HOLIDAY

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOPE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OPA

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] said is correct, and that under MPR-584, subdivision II, the OPA can order into Washington one of those down pillows, does it not follow that OPA can order in a quarter of beef, a case of eggs, or anything and everything else on which they can have a price? If that is true, and if that course is followed all the way through, there is no reason, is there, why we should appropriate so much money for the operation of the OPA? They will create a scandal if they continue to call for samples—especially of liquor of all kinds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

INTERSTATE PETROLEUM PIPE LINES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2600) to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate pe-

troleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, as amended, with Senate amendment thereto and to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 8, strike out "June 30, 1947" and insert "June 30, 1946."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the situation the Senate amendment simply reduces the time from 2 years to 1 year.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. There is no other change?

Mr. HARRIS. As the bill passed the House the Pipe Line Act was extended for 2 years, but the Senate reduced it to 1 year.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 93]

Adams	Delaney,	Hart
Anderson,	James J.	Healy
N. Mex.	Delaney,	Hébert
Andrews, N. Y.	John J.	Heffernan
Auchincloss	Dickstein	Hess
Baldwin, Md.	Dingell	Hobbs
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dolliver	Holtfield
Barden	Domeneaux	Holmes, Mass.
Barry	Durham	Hook
Bates, Mass.	Earthman	Jenkins
Bender	Eaton	Jennings
Bennet, N. Y.	Elliott	Johnson, Calif.
Bennett, Mo.	Elsaesser	Johnson,
Bloom	Elston	Lyndon B.
Bolton	Fellows	Johnson, Okla.
Boren	Fulton	Judd
Boykin	Gamble	Kelley, Pa.
Bradley, Mich	Gardner	Keogh
Bradley, Pa.	Gavin	Kerr
Brehm	Gibson	Kilburn
Brumbaugh	Gifford	Kirwan
Buckley	Gillette	Knutson
Bunker	Gillie	LaFollette
Butler	Goodwin	Lane
Byrne, N. Y.	Gore	Larcade
Camp	Gorski	Latham
Canfield	Graham	LeFevre
Carlson	Granahan	Lesinski
Case, N. J.	Grant, Ala.	Lewis
Celler	Gwinn, N. Y.	Luce
Chapman	Hagen	Lynch
Clason	Hale	McCowen
Cochran	Hall,	McGregor
Cole, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur	McKenzie
Cooley	Hall,	Madden
Corbett	Leonard W.	Maloney
Curley	Hancock	Mansfield,
Daughton, Va.	Hand	Mont.
Dawson	Harless, Ariz.	Martin, Iowa
De Lacy	Harness, Ind.	Martin, Mass.

Mason	Eoece, Tenn.	Stigler
May	Reed, Ill.	Taylor
Marrow	Rees, Kans.	Thom
Morrison	Rivers	Thomas, N. J.
Murphy	Robertson,	Torrens
O'Brien, Ill.	N. Dak.	Towe
Pfeifer	Roe, N. Y.	Voorhis, Calif.
Philbin	Rogers, Mass.	Vursell
Ploeser	Rooney	Wasielewski
Plumley	Sasser	Weaver
Powell	Savage	Welchel
Powers	Sharp	Weiss
Price, Fla.	Sheridan	Welch
Price, Ill.	Sikes	White
Quinn, N. Y.	Simpson, Ill.	Wilson
Rabaut	Simpson, Pa.	Winter
Rabin	Smith, Va.	Wood
Randolph	Stefan	Woodhouse
Rayfiel	Stewart	Worley

On this roll call 257 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to extend the statutes of limitations in certain cases.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in last night's Evening Star.

DISPOSITION OF NAVAL VESSELS AND FACILITIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 267 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3180, a bill to impose certain restrictions on the disposition of naval vessels and facilities necessary to the maintenance of the combatant strength and efficiency of the Navy, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto for final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "two" and insert "four."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution will make in order consideration of H. R. 3180, a bill to impose certain restrictions on the disposition of naval vessels and facilities necessary to the maintenance of the combatant strength and efficiency of the Navy and for other purposes.

There is nothing unusual about this rule at all. It appeared in the discussion before the Rules Committee that this bill has been reported unanimously by the legislative committee in charge. The rule provides for 4 hours' general debate and I shall not consume time in a discussion of the merits of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the rule which has been granted by the Rules Committee makes in order for 4 hours' general debate a bill, H. R. 3180, that has been unanimously reported by the Naval Affairs Committee. The sole purpose and objective of this bill is to restore to the Congress the power that it lost under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 over major naval property.

Mr. Speaker, by the terms of the Surplus Property Act Congress surrendered and divested itself of all power over the entire United States Navy except in the matter of battleships, airplane carriers, destroyers, cruisers, and submarines.

The Congress has lost complete control of all other property of the Navy. The sole object and purpose of this bill is to restore to the Congress in a review capacity only the control of the other properties of the Navy. We have specifically designated in the bill the property over which we think the Congress should at least have a review of before it is declared surplus.

You will observe that the bill refers to floating drydocks, auxiliaries, mine sweepers, ordnance plants, navy yards, and fixed property of that nature. Other properties of the Navy are not dealt with in this bill whatsoever. The Committee on Naval Affairs feels that it is the constitutional obligation of the Congress to provide and maintain a navy; therefore we should have at least an opportunity, in a review capacity, of saying what the United States Navy should be.

Let me impress this one fact upon you: We do not disturb in the slightest degree the declaration of surplus property in the Navy. We leave it entirely to the Navy Department to determine whatever property it may have in its custody and possession which it determines to declare surplus. We do not in the slightest degree interfere with the operation of the Surplus Property Act when the property reaches that agency. All we do is to say that the people's representatives who made this money available shall have an opportunity to review the declaration of surplus property by the Navy Department.

Mr. Speaker, that is the whole sum and substance of the bill. It does not do anything more than I stated or nothing less than I have stated. I cannot understand how there can be any valid objection from any Member of Congress to the Congress having an opportunity to review Navy Department declarations of surplus. The method pointed out in the bill would be that the Secretary of the Navy would certify to the Honorable Speaker of the House that they have concluded that certain property referred to in the bill is surplus, and then the Speaker of the House would inform the Congress. Then it would be up to the Congress to act, either in an affirmative or in a negative manner, within a period of 60 days. If the Congress concluded that it did not agree with the Navy Department in its declaration of surplus, then a concurrent resolution would have to be passed by the Congress disagreeing with the Navy Department.

On the other hand, if the Congress did nothing about it, then the property declared surplus by the Navy Department would be channeled through the Surplus Property Board for disposal.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. As a matter of fact, the gentleman's proposal is right in line with article IV, section 3, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall dispose of the territory or other property of the United States.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I have purposely asked that there be 4 hours of general debate so that every Member can have ample opportunity to discuss this bill because it is important. I am hoping that this rule will be adopted so that all Members may be thoroughly conversant with the various provisions of the bill.

Let me again impress on you this one fact: We do not declare what is surplus. We leave that entirely to the Navy Department. We do not deal with the disposition of the property in any way whatsoever, we merely ask that the people's representatives be informed in a due and orderly manner, instead of receiving our information in a Sunday night broadcast of Walter Winchell, or from Drew Pearson's column, that certain property has been declared surplus. Then Congress controls and knows what the composition of the United States Navy is, and it is the duty of the Congress to fix the composition of the Navy.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Are all the vessels that were made for the Government during this war under the supervision of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. Those that are built for the Navy are under the supervision of the Navy Department. Congress has lost complete control of every vessel—and those vessels cost hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars—except control of battleships, airplane carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. We say in the bill that all vessels over

1,000 tons shall be reported to the Congress if they are declared surplus, and then the Congress determines whether or not it agrees with the Secretary of the Navy in declaring them surplus.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. To make it clear in my own mind, where the Secretary of the Navy declares certain property to be surplus, that declaration cannot be effective and no disposition can be made of that property until the Congress acts. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. It has a 60-day review capacity.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Suppose Congress did not act.

Mr. VINSON. If Congress did not act, then the Secretary would dispose of it, because there must be a concurrent resolution on the part of Congress to stay the hand of the Secretary.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. All of us know how difficult it is to get a matter through Congress in 60 days if there is a fight on it. With only 60 days, may we not find ourselves without this protection, which I agree with the gentleman we desire so much?

Mr. VINSON. No. I think we can dispose of the matter within 60 days. We are using the same principle that was established in the reorganization legislation, that when a department was reorganized we would have a 60-day review or veto power.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What if the President should veto the action taken by the House and Senate within the 60 days and we could not pass it over the veto?

Mr. VINSON. It does not go to the President at all. It is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. What happens in case the Congress is not in session?

Mr. VINSON. The 60 days runs only when Congress is actually in session.

Mr. CHURCH. I wanted to clear that up.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. When the Navy Department reports to the Congress via the Speaker, is that information made available to the House, and does it go to the Committee on Naval Affairs for study?

Mr. VINSON. It goes to the Committee on Naval Affairs and that committee, of course, would put in the Record what the Speaker has been advised by the Secretary. In that way the Congress is notified.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield further, no nation can make an agreement to take those vessels over unless the Congress gives its approval?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is clearly mistaken. Under the Surplus Property Act today, the Navy Department could declare surplus any auxiliary

vessels or anything else of that kind and turn them over to a foreign nation, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania would have no voice in it. I am fighting that the gentleman have a voice in it.

Mr. RICH. That is what I want. I do not want the Government to turn them over to anybody.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman from Georgia has referred to naval vessels, but this bill would also cover naval installations, would it not?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. Under the Surplus Property Act that we passed here recently, the Navy Department could dispose of, say, the naval air station at Pensacola, Fla., without any action of Congress or without the permission of Congress.

Mr. VINSON. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. KILDAY. That base was established by authority of Congress, and the Navy Department could sell it without the permission of Congress.

Mr. VINSON. Every shore establishment in the United States, every naval base, every shipyard, every air station, under the language of the Surplus Property Act could tomorrow morning be declared surplus by the Navy Department, even though it has not fixed its postwar Navy, and you, the representatives of the people whose money has been invested in these facilities, would have no voice in the matter. I am asking that you have a power of veto in a review capacity. If Congress did not agree with the Secretary of the Navy, then Congress would pass the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. HARE. Does the Surplus Property Control Act apply to the disposal of Army air bases just as it does with reference to the naval air bases?

Mr. VINSON. It goes even further in the case of the Army. With reference to the Surplus Property Act, we do have one leg in the matter so far as the Navy is concerned, with reference to battleships and other combatant ships. As far as the Army is concerned, Fort Myer or any other Army facility, could be declared surplus tomorrow morning and Congress would have no voice in its disposition.

Mr. HARE. Would the gentleman be able to insert such a provision with reference to the Army air bases?

Mr. VINSON. No, for the simple reason it would not be in order because it is strictly applicable to the Navy. I may say the Committee on Military Affairs has prepared a bill. But the bill must provide for many technical matters and what would apply to the War Department would not necessarily apply to the Navy.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one observation?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. When we had the surplus-property bill here, the House inserted an amendment which would have taken care of that situation. The Senate had a similar amendment but the conferees took out both of them.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I still do not understand in these days when a nation is your friend one day and your enemy the next and the Navy is so important, why did you not give the Navy a veto power over such matters and keep that right until you granted it to the Congress?

Mr. VINSON. We think the Congress should have the veto power in these cases.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Perhaps I have not made my question clear to the gentleman. I think the Congress should have the right unless the Navy vetoed it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, in this report which is to be made in regard to the property that may be considered surplus, is it required that as a part of the report there shall be some statement as to the specific disposition of such surplus property?

Mr. VINSON. No, not at all. We do not deal at all with the disposition of the surplus property. That is left to the Surplus Property Board under the Surplus Property Act. We merely say, if the gentleman from Texas will permit me to proceed for a moment. Should the Secretary of the Navy conclude that the Dallas Air Field—for example, if you have one there—is surplus he would report that determination, together with other information, to the Speaker of the House. Then the Speaker of the House in turn would lay it before the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Naval Affairs Committee would notify Congress that the Navy Department had concluded that the Dallas Air Field is surplus.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I ask the gentleman a further question? I am not concerned with that particular point, but this gives authority to donate this property, which belonged to the Government, to persons and to governmental agencies in this country to foreign governments. Does the gentleman not think that somewhere in this legislation there ought to be some limitation upon the disposition of the property?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it does not permit the donation of the property to any agencies until such property reaches the surplus stage.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I understand that. Assuming that the property has reached the surplus stage, ought not

there to be some limitation upon the discretion of the agency of government to give away Government property?

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly what the bill is for, to provide that the Congress shall have control over it. Otherwise, we have no voice in it. It could be given away and you would not have nothing to say about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can add to the splendid presentation of the able chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I have been unable to discover any opposition to the adoption of this rule on the minority side. The objective of this bill is to restore to Congress appropriate authority and responsibility in the maintenance of our fleet, a fleet that is larger than the combined fleets of all nations. If this bill becomes a law, it gives Congress a veto voice in the disposition of major naval property. I believe we should have that voice and I hope this bill becomes a law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As I understand it, the bill gives Congress some control over the surplus property that the Navy decides is surplus?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Now perhaps the Congress might get to the place where they decide that the Navy had too much property on hand and the Navy did not care to declare any of their property or their docks or ships as surplus. Do we have any control over that situation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee to answer that question.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, you do, in the Appropriations Committee. We can refuse to appropriate the money to maintain that property.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But the money has already been appropriated. We have a tremendous Naval Establishment now. Perhaps the Navy will say, "We do not have any surplus," yet the Members of Congress will say, "You have all these docks and airfields and these naval facilities. Why do you not declare some of it surplus?"

Mr. VINSON. The only way to get the Navy not to use it is for the Congress to refuse to appropriate the money, because we do not reach out and say to the owning agency, "You must declare this or that surplus." We leave that to the owning agency.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I might add that this rule is an open rule and germane amendments to the bill are in order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I cannot see the Navy ever declaring anything surplus. The Navy has already had this appropriation for all of this building. They have this large surplus on hand now. They say, "We do not have any surplus. We will not declare it surplus."

Has the Congress any control over the property that they now have which we might think is surplus?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No. I see much merit in what the gentleman has stated. Perhaps he can offer some amendments to take care of that when we read the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the Congress have any control over the property which the Navy now has?

Mr. VINSON. Under the terms of the Surplus Property Act the Congress has no control whatsoever except over certain major combatant vessels. Now suppose the Navy Department finds itself with a great many planes that they think should be kept. Suppose the Congress says to the contrary. Then the Congress has the right always to authorize, by specific bill, that there be a sale of any Government property.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If those vessels are declared surplus and offered for sale, and some foreign countries went to bid on them, and there are American citizens who would like to bid on them and operate them, what are we going to do then with reference to who they shall be sold to? Will they be sold to the highest bidder or will we give preference to any American who might want to purchase them?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do not think this bill has anything to do with that. This bill merely states that the Congress shall give them authority to sell; not to say who they shall sell to.

Mr. RICH. I do not want them to be sold away from us. I want them kept for the American people if American people want to operate them, but I do not want the Federal Government to operate them.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. In response to the question asked by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], the Surplus Property Act would govern the sale. We do not seek in this bill at all to deal with the question of disposition of the material. All we ask is that the Congress have an opportunity for 60 days to review that which has been declared surplus.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the situation, it is about like this: The Congress passed the Surplus Property Act which provides for the disposition of surplus war property.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Under that law the Navy must first declare what is surplus.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. When the Navy has declared the surplus, then the responsibility for the sale and disposition rolls on to the shoulders of the Surplus Property organization. Under this bill the steps would be exactly the same except that after the Navy has declared the surplus, the Navy must notify Congress.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Then the disposition of the property is suspended, held in status quo, for a period of 60 days.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. If during that period of 60 days the Congress takes any action by concurrent resolution, then the property shall not be disposed of.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. The gentleman is correct. If Congress does not act then the Navy Department at the end of 60 days can go ahead and certify to the Surplus Property Board.

Mr. MICHENER. It just holds everything in suspension for 60 days.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think that is a fact, but will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Let us understand, then, that this bill does not deal with the disposition of property by the Navy Department other than its possible transfer to the Surplus Property Custodian.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs to answer the question.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Let us get that perfectly clear.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman restate his question?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. My question is: This bill does not deal with the disposition of property that belongs to the Navy except as to whether or not it shall be transferred by the Navy Department to the Surplus Property Custodian.

Mr. VINSON. That is the answer.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. This deals entirely with the Navy.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. As I look ahead I am satisfied that if this bill becomes a law it will be followed by a bill from the Committee on Military Affairs taking the same action as far as the War Department material is concerned.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. This is the first step in the program.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. It is the first step of the program for Congress to act for itself in its constitutional responsibility of providing and maintaining one of the arms of national defense.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I recall that when the surplus-property bill was adopted by this House the House did assume its prerogative of keeping the arms and did pass an amendment saying that they could not dispose of any ships. That was the Mott amendment. I also understand that was passed by the Senate. I should like to know why that was scuttled in conference.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. VINSON. The distinguished lady from Illinois has correctly stated it. The House did agree to what was known as the Mott-Magnuson amendment.

The Mott-Magnuson amendment required an affirmative voice. Nothing could be declared surplus in the Navy except by an affirmative act of the Congress. It is true that was unanimously agreed to here, but I am at a loss myself to know why it was scuttled in conference; nevertheless, it was scuttled.

In the bill that is to be considered we do not go as far as the Mott-Magnuson amendment; we do not require an affirmative act on the part of Congress; we simply say that Congress shall have the power of review and we allow Congress by concurrent resolution to decide whether or not it agrees with the Navy Department in a given instance.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think this is as important as anything that could come before this House. Right now we ought to have the Mott amendment for the reason that the gentleman knows what is going on in the Pacific.

Mr. VINSON. That is right, exactly.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman knows that Russia has no navy; the gentleman knows that Russia could not join Japan without a navy and that there are fears about it. It seems to me a very ill-advised idea not to take the full power here as we did in the Mott amendment.

Mr. VINSON. The lady is correct. During this period the Government has no idea of establishing its postwar Navy. It is absolutely absurd to think of the Navy at this period in this great war going into the field of surplus property.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Perhaps the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs can give me information on this subject. I agree perfectly, 100 percent, that the Congress ought to control the sale of this surplus property, but in looking over the report of the committee in the appendix I find a list of Navy-owned plants, of ordnance depots and stations, naval bases extending over several pages.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That must mean that we have billions of dollars invested in them.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And if the Navy should say they have no intention of declaring that surplus, what control has the Congress over the situation where they have billions of dollars tied up in plants and stations and depots and the Congress may feel with the war over that the Navy does not need such a large expanding plant. Have we any control over that?

Mr. VINSON. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska that that is completely covered.

One is to refuse to make appropriations to maintain them and the other is

for any Member of Congress at any time to offer a bill to dispose of any Government property that he thinks the Government should dispose of.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I can see where that may be necessary.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. It is a fact, furthermore, is it not, that under the Surplus Property Act the Surplus Property Board may compel any owning agency to turn in a list of its property and if it is not declared surplus within a reasonable time and under proper circumstances to ask why it has not been so declared?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true.

Mr. MOTT. This bill does not undertake to amend the Surplus Property Act in any way except to recapture jurisdiction by the Congress which it surrendered over naval property in the Surplus Property Act by giving the Congress, and not the executive agency, the last say in a disputed proposition.

Mr. BONNER. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs a question. The Coast Guard, being a part of the national defense and now under the Navy, anticipates returning to its former status; if that is good for the Navy and the national defense, why is not the same provision good for the Coast Guard?

Mr. VINSON. It is not only good for the Coast Guard but it is good for the Maritime Commission and it is good for the War Department.

Mr. BONNER. Under this bill you exempt the Coast Guard.

Mr. VINSON. While we may have jurisdiction over the Coast Guard now, by courtesy we are asking the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to handle that legislation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if we have not already made ourselves ridiculous by the passage of the act providing for the sale of surplus property, I wonder if we will not do so by the adoption of this legislation. What I mean is this: One of the standing committees of the House spent something like 2 years considering legislation which had to do with the disposal of surplus property held by various departments and agencies of the Government. Then the Congress passed a bill giving an agency created by it the power to dispose of that kind of property. A motion to recommit was defeated by a vote of 142 to 38, and the bill was passed without a record vote on August 22, 1944. If my understanding is correct, the Congress passed that bill because there was an accumulation of property which was of no particular value to the Nation as a whole, yet the various agencies and departments continued to hang onto it. If I am wrong, I shall be glad to be corrected.

When that bill was under consideration by a standing committee of the House, the Navy Department, the War Department, and other departments appeared and objected to any right which they might have to retain that property being

taken from them. They objected to any other department or any other agency of the Government disposing of any of that property, although each of them conceded that they had millions of dollars' worth of surplus property on hand.

The gentleman from Georgia says that we have a remedy. That is to say, we can refuse to appropriate money to maintain that sort of property. But suppose it is a dock or navy yard or a fleet of ships, anything—I will be glad to have the gentleman tell me, if ships, would he let them rot at the dock if the Navy does not want to dispose of them and has no need for them?

Mr. VINSON. As stated by the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, the Surplus Property Act requires every owning agency to certify sometime that it has certain surplus facilities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But there is a difference of opinion as to those facilities being surplus, and, therefore, they do not certify them as such, and no power on earth can compel them to do it; that is, to force the Navy, for instance, to make certain certifications. If the War Department has a million pairs of shoes on hand, they can hold them, after they come in with a similar bill, and get like authority to be exempted.

If we do not need legislation disposing of that kind of property, then let us repeal the act that we passed in 1944. Let us not go through the absurdity of taking off a bite here by the Navy Department and in a couple of weeks taking off some more for the War Department, and so continue until the whole act is destroyed. If we made a mistake or got something we did not need, or do not want, let us get rid of it.

It is the old, old fight as to whether you are to have an over-all controlling agency which is not interested in building up its own department and disposing of this property, or whether we want to let the various governmental agencies continue to hold onto everything on which they have their fingers.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. May I call the distinguished gentleman's attention to the fact that this bill specifically designates certain properties?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. As to certain property, such shoes, boots and scraps, they do not come to Congress at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Listen! The Navy may not, but here are 5 pages of definitions in this present bill exempting property which the Navy considers should not be sold or may consider should not be sold.

Mr. VINSON. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. VINSON. There is not a line in the bill exempting anything from being sold. There is not one line exempting certainly any property in the Navy from being sold.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that is so, why does the Navy need any legislation?

Mr. VINSON. The Navy may not need it, but the Congress does.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the Navy does not need it then let it be disposed of by the agency created by Congress. Oh, you are touchy about the Congress. For more than 10 years the Congress has been jumping through the hoop, jumping over the hurdles held up, set up by a ring master in the executive department. May I ask, has not the gentleman from Georgia—and I admire the gentleman very, very much; I like to go along with him when he gets after the surplus lieutenant commander of the Navy; who is such a disgrace to the Navy—sufficient faith and confidence in the Congress and in the agency which it created to dispose of this property to let them do the job as the Congress directed. If we have not, let us make one job of it and repeal that act. Would that not be better, may I ask the gentleman from Georgia? Tell us what you are getting at.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman complains because Congress has been jumping through the hoop. We have been jumping through the hoop so long that the Committee on Naval Affairs is tired and we think we are sent here with a certain responsibility, and I am only asking that the gentleman from Michigan live up to that responsibility that the Constitution puts upon us to provide and maintain a Navy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That I will do. I have voted for every appropriation asked by the Navy. You are just changing the holder of the hoop from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, to your Committee on Naval Affairs. It is now the one that wants us to jump through, and take a bite out of the Surplus Sales Act. If it is bad—if not working out—all right; let us repeal it or correct it, but let us avoid taking from the agency first one class of property, then another.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I will take just 2 or 3 minutes to try to ascertain the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. As I understand, we have no means under that act to force any military agency, the Navy or the Army or the Maritime Commission, to declare that their property is surplus; am I correct in that? I would like to have someone who has the information answer that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to respond to the gentleman. Section 11 of the act prescribes that no Navy Department, no War Department, or property of any other department can be disposed of by the Surplus Property Administration unless that department declares it surplus.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In other words, the Navy must first declare it surplus.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely, and the Congress after considering this matter for 2 months amended it so as to provide that no agency except the Navy Department itself should declare that property surplus. Moreover, the bill before us and the Surplus Property Act itself prevents the disposal of any combat vessels whatsoever in identical language.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree that the bill before us is important and it is necessary legislation in order that the Congress should have some control over the property that the Navy says is surplus.

The matter that concerns me, however, is this, that in the summary here you will find seven pages of material owned by the Navy Department. Suppose the Navy does not wish to declare that property surplus; how then could the Congress say to the Navy, "The war is over. You have naval ordnance stores, you have huge plants that are no longer needed." How could we make the Navy declare that to be surplus property which they must dispose of through some agency? I am certain that the surplus property law which we passed does not cover that subject.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. I think I can partly answer the gentleman's question. As I said a moment ago, the Surplus Property Disposal Act—and this bill is not an amendment to that—provides that the owning agency shall from time to time declare what surplus property it has. Then it is disposed of by the disposing agency. If an owning agency has property that the Surplus Property Board thinks ought to be declared surplus, it may call upon that agency for a report on what is believed to be surplus. There is no way that the Board can compel an owning agency to declare its property surplus. However, in a case of that kind, the Congress always has authority and can pass a bill declaring it surplus and dispose of it. That must not be confused with this bill, which is not an amendment to the Surplus Property Disposal Act at all, except that this bill does recapture and revert in the Congress the final right to say whether major naval property shall be disposed of, in event the Congress deems it proper to exercise that right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman from Oregon, but I think that he must also see that there is a possibility that not only the Navy but the Army might have under its control a huge amount of property that should rightly be declared surplus and which the Congress might feel should be declared surplus; but unless we pass a law or take some other means of forcing them to declare that property to be surplus, they might hold on to these large stores, whether they be shoes or battleships or ordnance plants or what not, indefinitely.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman may be quite right, but a proposal of that kind

should not be incorporated into the bill before us. It should be offered as an amendment to the Surplus Property Disposal Act itself.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think that an amendment might be in order and be germane to this bill which would force the Navy to declare certain property to be surplus?

Mr. MOTT. No; my own opinion is that such an amendment would not be germane to this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It does seem to me that some legislation sooner or later will have to be considered by the Congress along that line.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. May I ask the chairman of the committee this question. In looking over the list of plants in the report, I find none described as being located in any foreign waters or foreign territory.

Do we have possessions coming under the jurisdiction of this proposed legislation such as repair yards for ships or other Navy facilities necessary for the operation of the Navy that are located in foreign waters or foreign countries? If there are, I find none listed here.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that under the definition of plants as used in the bill, those are the only plants that fall within the purview of those definitions. Therefore, of all the Government property, these would be the only ones that would be certified to the Congress when the owning agency, the Navy, found them to be surplus.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. In the event that the Navy had control of plants in the deep Pacific, could the Navy go ahead and sell those plants without coming to the Congress and getting the consent provided for in this bill?

Mr. VINSON. It certainly could, and it can do that without this bill. It does it under the Surplus Property Act. This bill does not interfere with it in any way. We leave it just exactly where it was.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Then Congress has nothing to do with the property that is not located in the United States? They can go ahead with that?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; it has something to do with any plant that falls within the definition of the word "plant" as used in the bill; that is, where the Government owns the land, where the Government built the buildings, where the Government owns the equipment, where it is able to be operated as an independent economic unit, then it is within the definition, and those are the plants.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. What aroused my curiosity was the description "without the limits of the United States."

Mr. VINSON. I do not think we built any outside of the United States.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In the definition of controls that the Navy has over the plants, as I understand the Surplus Property Act at the present time, it specifies only property up to a cost of \$5,000,000 can be disposed of.

Mr. VINSON. No; the gentleman is mistaken. Under the provision with reference to \$5,000,000, it means after the owning agency, the Navy Department in this case, has certified to the surplus property controlling agency that they have declared as surplus a plant costing more than \$5,000,000, that is certified after the horse has left the stables. It is certified after it has been disposed of. We are stepping in between the declaration of the surplus and the disposal of it and say that Congress be notified.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this is probably one of the most important bills that will come before the Congress in this session. It involves billions of dollars in property. As stated candidly by its sponsors, it is intended to delay, and thus nullify so far as the Navy is concerned with reference to the property described in this bill, the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. The House will recall that about a year ago the President of the United States, by Executive order, provided for reconversion and established the War Mobilization and Reconversion Agency and Contract Settlement Agency and the Surplus Property Agency. He sent messages to the Congress and asked the Congress to implement those executive agencies by legislation. It is said that the purpose of the bill is to restore to the Congress its constitutional authority. How does Congress provide a navy? How does Congress wage war? It does so through the Navy Department and the War Department. How can Congress provide for the disposal of surplus property? Only through its agency. The provision in the Surplus Property Act for disposal was considered by this Congress after the Committee on Postwar Planning approved the Baruch report; after this committee of the House charged with reporting the bill had considered it; and after Congress had spent the months of August and September last year considering this matter, the Surplus Property Act was passed. The Surplus Property Act is not perfect. This bill does not intend to amend that act. Candidly, the proponents of this bill say they propose to nullify its provisions.

Under the terms of that act no combat vessel can be disposed of by the Surplus Property Administration. There is no disagreement between that act and the present bill. This bill reaffirms, and I am glad to say it reassures me, in describing in identical language the combat vessels which cannot be disposed of. Before the Congress passed the Surplus Property Act last year we had reports from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and we declined to put any provision in that act which did not protect the War Depart-

ment or the Navy Department in both war and peace. We modified a provision of that bill which would have enabled the Surplus Property Administrator to have in anywise persuaded and compelled them to declare any property surplus. The Congress of the United States has provided in about 100 statutes for the disposition of Government property. Only the Congress can provide for the disposal of property. After repeated and careful consideration for 2 months last year as a part of the reconversion program of the United States, the Congress enacted the Surplus Property Act and provided that the plants mentioned in this bill to the value of billions of dollars might be reconverted so that the citizens of this country employed in those plants might have employment in peace. It was a part of the reconversion program of the President of the United States. It was not premature. He urged that it be adopted before the invasion of Europe, before the surrender of Germany. I have before me the report of the committee that submitted that bill to the House and the report of the Secretary of the Navy. That report, as did the report of the Under Secretary of War, who reported after taking the matter up with the Bureau of the Budget, urged the passage of that bill.

In this connection I want to read from the report of the Secretary of the Navy, because as a member of that committee, I insisted that there be no provision embraced in that act that would in anywise impede the Navy in prosecuting the war. I insisted that not one dollar's worth of property under the supervision of the Navy Department should be declared surplus except by the Department. But now it is said that in order to restore the constitutional prerogative of Congress to dispose of surplus property, this bill must be passed. Can Congress go into the business of disposing of twenty or fifty or one hundred billion dollars' worth of property? We must do it through some agency of the Government. We entrusted the matter of the lives of our sons to the generals of the Army and the admirals of the fleet. An admiral of the fleet could surrender, but it would be unthinkable that he would make a base surrender. It is unthinkable that the War Department or the Navy Department would declare, in peace or in war, any property surplus that was essential to the waging of the war.

It was stated on the floor of the House that as far as the Navy Department was concerned but little, if any, property, except where there was a surplus, outmoded, needed by the civilian population of the country, would be declared surplus until after the war with Japan was over. I want to read from the report of the Secretary of the Navy.

He said he concurred in the report of Capt. Lewis Strauss, and I will ask permission to insert his report on surplus property. I quote:

If section 7 were changed to eliminate the objection mentioned—

In section 7, as introduced, it was provided that the Surplus Property Admin-

istrator might have some power to declare Navy or Army property surplus. We amended it just exactly in the language recommended by General Clay, representing the War Department, and just exactly in the language recommended by the Secretary of the Navy, and I quote from the report of the Navy Department:

If section 7 were changed to eliminate the objection mentioned above, the Navy Department could, in my judgment, strongly recommend the early enactment of H. R. 5125 as essential to a successful and orderly solution of the surplus war property disposal problem.

I have before me the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, dated June 10, 1944, transmitting that report and endorsing it and concurring therein.

I call attention to this significant statement: That there was not a single witness at the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs for the pending bill, which hearings were only made available this morning, except representatives of the Navy Department. I call attention to the fact that the Secretary of the Navy himself has given this bill a half-hearted report and support. He says that the passage of this bill would slow down the disposal of surplus property. He said this bill would not in any wise interfere with the operation of the Navy, but he said, and I quote:

This would have the effect, under certain circumstances, of slowing up the disposal of property which the Navy has determined to be surplus to its needs.

Of course, it is understood if that is slowed up by this bill the Congress of the United States will be expected to make appropriations to maintain the plants that may not be necessary, to maintain the facilities in this bill that might not be necessary or surplus, and the burden would be on Congress to provide for the delay or the prevention of the orderly disposition of the property only declared by the Navy Department to be surplus.

The Surplus Property Act provides that the Surplus Property Administration shall publish its rules and regulations in the Federal Register. The purpose of this bill is to delay and to impede the disposal of airfields, the disposal of small boats over 1,000 tons not in combat class, and to impede the disposal of war plants.

I invite your attention to the fact it involves billions of dollars. Under the terms of the pending bill the Navy Department can prevent after the war the disposal of any plant provided by the Defense Plant Corporation that the Navy says it would like to have maintained even though that plant has long ceased to manufacture munitions. I call attention to this feature and I propose to undertake to go into this matter further in general debate.

Take the matter of plants under the Surplus Property Act. A plant costing over \$5,000,000 cannot be disposed of until after the expiration of 3 months, in which reports are to be submitted and then after the Surplus Property Board has submitted the report to Congress,

Congress has 30 days to veto the disposal. What are the terms of this act? It states that no property shall be disposed of except as provided herein. All on earth the Navy Department has got to do under the terms of this bill is to report that that property is surplus, with its reasons.

The Surplus Property Act requires that the Board submit a report on all plants of \$5,000,000 or over, whether it be one of the aluminum plants named in the report on the pending bill, or whether it be one of the steel plants named in the report, and the act provides that in the report submitted by the Surplus Property Board, the cost of the plant to the Government shall be given and the plan of the Board with respect to the disposal of plants shall be submitted. In addition, on all property valued at more than \$1,000,000 the report of the Attorney General must be made as to whether it violates the antitrust laws or promotes monopolies, before the property can be disposed of. In the pending bill the Navy Department merely states that the property is surplus and no information whatsoever that would enable Congress to dispose of the property or plant is required of the Navy Department. Congress would be in no position to take action. The bill again promotes delay and adds to the confusion and the conflicts in the Surplus Property Act. The complaints against the Surplus Property Administration are largely because of the delays in disposal of plants. Such delays, however, are not the fault of the Surplus Property Board. Congress provided for the reports and the bill stipulates the delays. The fault is with Congress. Personally I opposed the Surplus Property Board. I advocated an administrator. I opposed other provisions of the bill. The unsound provisions of the act are responsible for the resignation of Mr. Will Clayton, the Administrator. If Congress further hampers and delays the administration of the Surplus Property Act by the nullifying provisions of the pending bill, then I predict that the chairman of the Board will resign and that it will be difficult to get competent administrators to administer the act. Congress has muddled the waters and has messed up the disposal of surplus property far too much already. The pending bill would further destroy the disposal of surplus property. The fair way, the proper way to correct any defects in the existing law is to amend that law. The bill under consideration should be defeated. Congress should give careful consideration to amending and repealing the delaying and conflicting provisions of the existing law as soon as the Surplus Property Board has had an opportunity to submit its recommendations. I advocate giving the Board a chance. If it cannot function, I advocate amending the act rather than nullifying it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask at this time to include in my remarks now and to include in the remarks I expect to make on the bill in the Committee of the Whole letters from the

Surplus Property Administration opposing this bill, letters from the Secretary of the Navy endorsing the Surplus Property Act, and letters from the Secretary of War.

Mr. VINSON. And, if the gentleman will permit, will he also include a copy of my letter to him?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And a copy of the letter from the gentleman from Georgia written to me, and other correspondence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, that this is an exceedingly important question is evident from the debate thus far on the rule.

I hope the House will adopt the resolution so that the subject may be further considered.

I now move the previous question on the resolution to its final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION OF NAVAL VESSELS AND FACILITIES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3180) to impose certain restrictions on the disposition of naval vessels and facilities necessary to the maintenance of the combatant strength and efficiency of the Navy, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3180, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with, the bill to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand the request it applies only to the first reading of the bill, not the reading of the bill for amendment.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That as used in this Act the term—

(a) "Naval war facility" means any property of the United States or of any instrumentality of the United States, within any of the following categories, under the control of the Department of the Navy:

(1) Any vessel classified in, or classifiable in accordance with, the classification set forth in Standard Nomenclature and List of United States Naval Vessels, published December 1, 1944, by the Department of the Navy (Bureau of Ships), as a vessel of any of the following types: A battleship, cruiser, aircraft carrier, destroyer, or submarine.

(2) Any floating drydock, or any vessel (other than vessels of not more than one thousand tons) classified in, or classifiable in accordance with, the classification set forth in Standard Nomenclature and List of United States Naval Vessels, published December 1, 1944, by the Department of the Navy (Bureau of Ships), as a vessel of any of the following types: A mine vessel, patrol vessel, auxiliary, landing ship, or district craft. For the purposes of this subsection the term "one thousand tons" means 1,000 tons standard displacement, unless the Secretary of the Navy determines that measurement in terms of gross tons in the manner provided in section 4153 of the Revised Statutes is more appropriate, in which case such term means gross tons measured in the manner provided in such section 4153.

(3) Any navy yard, navy air field, naval training station, naval ordnance plant or depot, naval base, or any other property, consisting of land having buildings or other structures thereon or having buildings or other structures used in connection therewith, which constitutes the whole or any part of a naval station, excluding, in the case of any of the foregoing, property acquired or constructed by the Navy for use solely in connection with programs for the training of naval personnel at colleges and universities (other than the U. S. Naval Academy).

(4) Any plant acquired, constructed, or used to manufacture or produce articles, materials, or supplies for the Navy.

(b) "Plant" includes only a plant (consisting of land, including land under option to the United States, and structures substantially equipped with machinery, tools, and equipment) which is capable of economic operation as a separate and independent unit, and which is not an integral part of a larger installation of a private contractor.

SEC. 2. No provision of existing law shall be deemed to authorize—

(1) the sale, lease, donation, or other disposition, of any naval war facility to any person, or to any political entity or governmental instrumentality, foreign or domestic; or

(2) the consent to a sale, lease, donation, or other disposition of any plant with respect to which consent of the Department of the Navy is required before a sale, lease, donation, or other disposition thereof can be made; or

(3) a determination that any naval war facility is surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the Department of the Navy, or the transfer of any naval war facility from the jurisdiction or control of the Department of the Navy;

except subject to the restrictions prescribed in this act.

SEC. 3. Except as provided in section 5, no naval war facility described in section 1 (a) (1) shall be sold, leased, donated, or otherwise disposed of, to any person, or to any political entity or governmental instrumentality, foreign or domestic, or be transferred from the jurisdiction or control of the Department of the Navy, or be determined to be surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the Department of the Navy.

SEC. 4. Except as provided in section 5, no naval war facility described in section 1 (a) (2), (3), or (4) shall be sold, leased, donated, or otherwise disposed of to any person or to any political entity or governmental instrumentality, foreign or domestic, or be transferred from the jurisdiction or control of the Department of the Navy, or be determined to be surplus to the needs

and responsibilities of the Department of the Navy, and no consent to a sale, lease, donation, or other disposition of any plant described in section 2 (2) shall be given by the Department of the Navy, in either case unless—

(a) the Secretary of the Navy has made a report to the Congress (while both Houses are in session) setting forth the reasons why such facility or plant, as the case may be, is no longer needed by the Department of the Navy, together with the contrary views, if any, of the Chief of Naval Operations;

(b) sixty days have elapsed since the making of such report (not counting as part of such 60 days any period between the end of one session of Congress and the beginning of the next, or any period during which both Houses of Congress are in recess under the terms of a concurrent resolution); and

(c) during such 60 days the Senate and House of Representatives have failed to pass a concurrent resolution stating in substance that such facility or plant, as the case may be, should be retained by or for the use of the Department of the Navy:

Provided, That property disposals, considered to require expeditious action by the Secretary of the Navy, may be made by the Department of the Navy immediately after the Senate and House of Representatives have passed a concurrent resolution approving the property disposal or disposals proposed by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 5. (a) No provision of this act shall prevent—

(1) the disposition under any other law of any vessel stricken from the Navy register pursuant to section 2 of the act of August 5, 1882, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, and for other purposes"; or

(2) the disposition of any vessel under the act of April 29, 1943, entitled "An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto", as amended; or

(3) the lease, under any other law, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, of any naval war facility, for any period not extending beyond the date proclaimed by the President as the date of the termination of the present war, or beyond the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever first occurs; or

(4) any naval war facility from being made subject to any command or use determined to be appropriate in connection with the prosecution of the present war; or

(5) the transfer of the Coast Guard, together with its functions, property, and personnel, to the jurisdiction of another agency of the Government, or, in the case of any naval war facility acquired from any other agency of the Government under an arrangement providing for its return, the return of such facility to such Government agency pursuant to such arrangement; or

(6) the disposition of any naval war facility to any person pursuant to the exercise by such person of an option granted by the United States prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, or thereafter if granted in connection with the original procurement of such naval war facility; or

(7) the scrapping or destruction of any vessel damaged beyond economical repair; or

(8) the termination by the Department of the Navy of any lease or charter-party.

(b) Any plant under the control of the Department of the Navy may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, be leased for periods not exceeding 5 years each:

Provided, That—

(1) the Secretary of the Navy has made a report to the Congress (while both Houses are in session) of the intention of the Navy Department to lease such plant;

(2) sixty days have elapsed since the making of such report (not counting as part of such 60 days any period between the end of one session of Congress and the beginning of the next, or any period during which both Houses of Congress are in recess under the terms of a concurrent resolution); and

(3) during such 60 days the Senate and House of Representatives have failed to pass a concurrent resolution stating in substance that such plant should not be leased.

(c) No disposition of property shall be deemed to be contrary to the provisions of this act, insofar as the right, title, and interest of any person in and to such property is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Oregon for 2 hours.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, a member of the committee that brought the surplus-property bill before the House for consideration, finds himself in considerable disagreement with the unanimous report of the Committee on Naval Affairs in regard to this bill.

Now I do not find myself much in disagreement with the Surplus Property Act. On the contrary, I think it was absolutely wise and essential and, I repeat, there is not one line in this bill that disturbs in the slightest degree the operations of the Surplus Property Act. I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi to point out to the House a single sentence in the bill which interferes with the disposal of property when it reaches the Surplus Property Disposal Board.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will turn to page 5 of the bill, at the bottom of the page, I read: "may be made by the Department of the Navy." There is nothing stated in this bill—

Mr. VINSON. Just read the language.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The language is:

That property disposals, considered to require expeditious action by the Secretary of the Navy, may be made by the Department of the Navy.

That language would give the Secretary of the Navy, in my humble judgment, the right to dispose of it. Now, to answer the gentleman further, I challenge the gentleman to point to any language in his bill that would provide for this property to be disposed of by the Surplus Property Administration; and I call attention again to the fact that on page 5, line 23, the language is "*Provided*, That property disposals, considered to require expeditious action by the Secretary of the Navy, may be made by the Department of the Navy," regardless of the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. VINSON. It is true there is nothing in the bill which says that the Surplus Property Act steps in and does certain things, because the Surplus Property Act is already the law when certain conditions arise.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is frank. Is it not true that the language of this bill, page 5, line 23, is as follows: "by the Department of the Navy," and would nullify the provisions of the Surplus Property Act so far as this bill or section is concerned?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As far as you go.

Mr. VINSON. Not at all. Another thing, the gentleman from Mississippi talked about making a report to the Congress and said that nothing costing over \$5,000,000 can be sold until the Congress exercises its power of veto.

Let us see if the gentleman is correct. Sections 11 (c), 19, and 24 of the Surplus Property Act require that the Surplus Property Board make a report to the Congress of, first, the owning agencies failing to report surpluses; second, plans for disposition of certain classes of property costing more than \$5,000,000, and third, for evaluation of the Board's administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

Now, there is nothing in the act which grants the power to Congress to act affirmatively or negatively on the disposal of surplus property by the Board under the act. Regardless of the amount, whether it is \$1 or \$5,000,000, the Surplus Property Board does not have to have an affirmative or negative act of Congress to dispose of that property. All the Surplus Property Board does is to acquaint the Congress with the fact that certain facilities described in the bill, costing more than \$5,000,000, have been disposed of. Am I not correct?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is not correct. On the contrary, section 10 states "submit a report of property costing over \$5,000,000, describing the amount, the cost and the location of the property, and setting forth other descriptive information." Nothing like that is embraced in the gentleman's bill.

Mr. VINSON. Of course not. You see, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in speaking about the authority of the Surplus Property Act has gone a little bit too far. It does not have to have any affirmative or negative act by the Congress.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. It is a fact, however, is it not, that in case there is not any question about the desirability or necessity of disposing of surplus property coming within the provisions of the act that the Congress, after the proposal to dispose of it is submitted to the Congress, if it is not a matter of dispute, could forego the waiting of 60 days by simply putting a bill on the Consent Calendar for its immediate disposal.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I call his attention to this provision in the Surplus Property Act? Turn to section 19.

Mr. VINSON. I just read that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then turn to section 19, subparagraph (c):

Whenever the Board may deem it to be in the interest of the objectives of this act it may authorize the disposition of any surplus property listed in classes 9 to 12, inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section. With respect to the property listed in classes 1 to 8, inclusive, no disposition shall be made or authorized until 30 days after such report (or additional report) has been made while Congress is in session, except that the Board may authorize any disposal agency to lease any such property for a term of not more than 5 years.

In other words, with respect to these plants that cost over \$5,000,000, that Board must make a report to us within 3 months, and after they submit that report covering categories from 1 to 8 they cannot dispose of it for 30 days, thus giving Congress the right to veto or prevent disposal.

Mr. VINSON. But that provision does not vest any authority in Congress. The only way Congress could act would be to pass limiting legislation within that 30-day period. We do not have to have any affirmative voice in Congress. We do not have to have any negative voice. What does this bill do?

Mr. Chairman, by the terms of the Surplus Property Act Congress retained control only over the disposition of battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines, which are only a part of the combatant fleet.

By the Surplus Property Act Congress surrendered all of its control over all other property belonging to the Navy, to the executive branch of the Government. Therefore, this left Congress without either an affirmative or a negative voice over the remaining property belonging to the Navy or a review of what property the Navy declares to be surplus.

This bill, H. R. 3180, is designed to give Congress a review over any decision of the Navy Department declaring any of the following naval facilities to be surplus:

First. Any floating drydock, or any mine vessel, patrol vessel, auxiliary, landing ship, or district craft of a thousand tons or more;

Second. Any navy yard, navy airfield, naval training station, naval ordnance plant or depot, naval base, or other installation; and

Third. Any Government-owned plant under Navy cognizance for producing articles, materials, or supplies for the Navy, excepting so-called "scrambled" plants and plants not capable of economic operation as a separate and independent unit, and plants which are an integral part of a larger installation of a private contractor.

At the very outset let me impress this fact upon you: The Navy Department, and the Navy Department alone, reaches the decision as to whether any of the property referred to in this bill is surplus.

After the Navy Department concludes that any of the naval property referred to in this bill is a surplus to the Navy's needs, then all that this bill does is to require the Secretary of the Navy to so certify to the Congress, and the Congress has 60 days while in session to re-

view the findings of the Navy; and if it does not agree with the Navy it so expresses its views in a concurrent resolution.

This bill does not in the slightest degree interfere with the disposal of surplus property as provided for by the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

I repeat, Congress does not determine what naval property is surplus. That is left exclusively to the Navy Department. But Congress should have the right to review the declaration of surplus property by the Navy before it is certified to the Surplus Property Board for disposal.

The Naval Affairs Committee is asking that Congress have the right to review the Navy Department's declaration of surplus of its major property, and only that property which is specifically enumerated in this bill, and in this way Congress lives up to its constitutional responsibility of maintaining a Navy.

No Member of Congress can object to the peoples' Representatives having the opportunity of reviewing the conclusions of the Navy Department as to which property the Navy finds it no longer needs.

The authority contained in the bill is for the Congress to review the declaration of major surplus property, which is specifically designated and described in the bill, and under no condition would Congress have anything to do with the actual disposal. For clarity and emphasis, I repeat: We leave the declaration of surplus to the Navy Department, and the disposal of the surplus to the proper Surplus Property Disposal Agency.

In presenting the bill H. R. 3180 to the House for consideration, I deem it important at the very outset to call attention to its limited scope and purpose.

The bill is merely to insure that Congress will have appropriate notice and a 60-day opportunity to act by concurrent resolution prior to disposal of any of the more important naval vessels, and navy yards, airfields, ordnance plants, and other installations, including Government-owned plants under Navy cognizance.

This purpose can be accomplished, and under the provisions of the bill will be accomplished, without in any measure defeating the purposes of the Surplus Property Act, to which I heartily subscribe, and without interfering with the proper functions, authority, or administration of the Navy Department.

As I have indicated, the provisions of the bill cover only the very important items of naval equipment vitally connected with the national defense, and in no way affect disposal of so-called scrambled plants or plants not capable of economic operation as separate and independent units, or unimproved real estate. Neither does the bill affect disposals under purchase options.

The legislation excludes ships under a thousand tons and, regardless of tonnage, vessels disposable under the so-called Fishing Vessels Act of April 29, 1943, as amended. Of course, the bill does not in any way apply to the disposition of the enormous quantities of articles, supplies, and raw materials of the Navy Department.

The bill is very simple. Except for authorizing leases of plants for terms of not more than 5 years, the bill does not authorize dispositions of any kind. Further, it does not prohibit disposition of any kind. It merely grants a power of review to Congress over the Navy Department's declarations of certain surpluses.

The bill reaffirms the policy of Congress prohibiting disposal of our battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines, but does not change the existing law on the subject.

Neither does it change existing law as to disposition of vessels over a thousand tons—the disposition of vessels stricken from the Navy Register pursuant to the act of August 5, 1882.

On receipt by the Congress of notice of a proposed sale or other disposition, Congress may determine that the disposition should not be made and pass an appropriate concurrent resolution barring the proposed disposition, or Congress may fail to pass a resolution for 60 days, in which case the proposed disposition may then be made.

While the bill H. R. 3180 is thus a very simple and, I believe, a noncontroversial measure, it is one of the most important bills which the Naval Affairs Committee has recently reported to the Congress. In subject matter it applies to those naval vessels and naval installations which are vital to the national defense, and in purpose it marks a return to basic principles established by the Constitution and faithfully observed by the Congress for more than 150 years.

The Naval Affairs Committee earnestly recommends enactment of the bill for three highly important reasons:

First. It will restore to the Congress its Constitutional function of maintaining our Navy;

Second. It will restore the system of checks and balances between the executive and legislative departments insofar as these relate to important naval ships and facilities; and

Third. It will insure that Congress will receive notice in an orderly manner of proposed dispositions of these important facilities prior to their disposal, instead of first learning that an important naval unit has been sold from a Sunday night broadcast of Walter Winchell or some other radio commentator, or from the newspaper column of Drew Pearson or some other columnist.

The Congress has magnificently performed its Constitutional function of providing a Navy. There are as many vessels in our Navy today as there were officers and enlisted men in our prewar Navy. Obviously, many of these vessels will have to be disposed of at the end of hostilities. Comparatively few of these fall within the classification of battleship, cruiser, aircraft carrier, destroyer, or submarine. Over these classes the Congress has retained, and I hope always will retain, such control that they may be sold only pursuant to special act.

But Congress has lost control over all the multiplied thousands of other naval vessels. Congress has lost control over the district craft of the 54 classes you

will find listed in the appendix in the report on the pending bill, and the 10 classes of landing ships and landing craft. It has lost control over all vessels of the 8 classes of mine vessels and the eighty-odd classes of patrol vessels you will find listed in this appendix.

This control passed from the hands of Congress under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. I believe that the situation is such as to justify transfer of absolute control of disposition of the less important of these vessels to the executive department of the Government, but certainly does not justify stripping the Congress of all vestige of control of the vital naval units.

Our bill applies only to these important units. It does not apply to any vessels of the types listed as landing craft or miscellaneous, nor does it apply to any of the vast number of landing ships and other auxiliary vessels under a thousand tons. It applies only to the larger vessels. Fishing and commercial vessels under the act of April 29, 1943, regardless of size, would also be excluded, as would the vessels acquired from the Maritime Commission under an arrangement for their return. Accordingly, only a comparatively small number of naval ships of the kind most important to maintain the fighting strength of the Navy would be subject to the provisions of this bill.

Your committee felt that notice to the Congress of the proposed disposition of this important group of vessels and opportunity by the Congress to exercise a power of review if found necessary was the minimum that could be done consistent with the Constitution and the legislative precedents of the past 150 years.

Equally important with auxiliary vessels in maintaining the fighting strength of the Navy are the naval installations and plants necessary for keeping our fighting ships in repair and supplied with necessary ordnance and other war material. Accordingly, it was felt by your committee that the constitutional duty and legislative precedents required the same type of procedure in the case of naval installations and plants as in the case of the larger naval vessels.

The legislation carefully excludes the so-called "scrambled" facilities. Under the stress of war and the necessity of expansion which plant owners did not believe would be of postwar value, it was necessary, unfortunately, in many instances to erect structures on the grounds of manufacturers and install machinery in these buildings and in manufacturers' plants which, in many cases, must be entirely scrapped after the war. It was not felt that facilities of this character should be included within the purview of the bill since no useful purpose would be served thereby, and similarly it was not felt desirable to include facilities which, while wholly owned by the Government, are of little or no economic value except as part of the larger plant of a private manufacturer. These, too, were excluded in the bill.

A list of all of the plants which would be affected by the bill is contained in the appendix to the report on the bill. You will note that there are 19 shipbuild-

ing and ship-repair yards and 183 plants of other types. These are, of course, located all over the country, and unquestionably it will be wise to dispose of a very considerable number of them. But it would not be feasible at this time to attempt to review these various plants and make a determination as to which should be disposed of and which are of such a character that disposition would be a fatal error. Therefore, under the bill it is provided that these may be sold only when, on their determination as surplus to the needs of the Navy, notice of the proposed disposition is submitted to the Congress. The Naval Affairs Committee believes that inclusion of the naval war facilities above referred to in the bill meets, and does not go beyond, the constitutional duty of the Congress.

The longer I remain in public life the more I appreciate the wisdom of our forefathers in distributing duties under the Constitution between the executive, legislative, and judicial departments. It is only by observance of the system of checks and balances thus established that our Government has survived the vicissitudes of war and the enormous pressure in war and peace to centralize too much authority in too few hands.

Under section 8 of the Constitution, the function of providing and maintaining the Navy was made a function of the Congress, and in keeping with its duties under the function Congress has always surrounded the disposition of naval property with rigid restrictions and has permitted disposition only pursuant to enactment of specific legislation. This long-established policy of Congress is reflected in such recent legislation as the act of May 17, 1938, the acts of June 18, 1940, and July 19 of the same year, and by the acts of February 19, 1943, and April 4, 1944.

It was most unfortunate that the Surplus Property Act safeguards inserted by the House, which were in keeping with the provision of the Constitution and the precedents above referred to, were entirely scrapped in conference between the House and the Senate, when they should have been merely modified to be made workable. This bill in substance is such a modification.

In the enthusiasm for achieving the primary purposes of the Surplus Property Act, just as in the enthusiasm for accomplishing the purposes of the Lend-Lease Act, Congress unfortunately gave too broad authority, too much of a blank check, to the executive department of our Government. In the case of the Lend-Lease Act, authority to make disposition of important naval units was so broad as to permit irrevocable loss of these units. The Naval Affairs Committee, on recognizing this, recommended to the Congress legislation limiting dispositions of these facilities under the Lend-Lease Act. The Congress, in considering this legislation, by the act of February 19, 1943, restricted such dispositions to leases for not longer than the duration of the war and with title retention in the United States.

The same kind of situation exists today because of the enactment of the Surplus Property Act and the same kind of recommendation is made, namely, that

of placing some limits on too broad a grant of authority to the executive department. It is again necessary to consider legislation which would not interfere with the purposes of the grant of authority and which would yet place appropriate limitations and conditions upon its exercise. H. R. 3180 would do just this.

Members of the House will remember that the amendment to the Surplus Property Act, known popularly as the Mott-Magnuson amendment, would have prohibited any disposition of combat naval vessels, stations, and establishments without the consent of Congress, and was adopted unanimously by this House. Unquestionably, the amendment was so broad as to interfere materially with the purposes of the Surplus Property Act. However, it could have been appropriately modified, but instead was scrapped by the conferees.

The legislation before you would carry out the purposes of the Mott-Magnuson amendment without being subject to the objections which were raised to that amendment. It would not prohibit decisions as to surplus and disposals under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. It would not require the delay of securing an affirmative act of Congress for each disposition. It would not affect all naval property but merely the important ships, naval installations and plants as I have outlined above.

In commenting upon the provisions of the legislation, the Secretary of the Navy, in his letter of May 2, 1945, stated:

Under this provision it is contemplated that the Navy Department will prepare a list of such facilities and submit the same to Congress. If Congress should fail to disapprove of the proposed dispositions during such 60-day period, the normal procedures for the disposition of property established by the Surplus Property Act would then be followed. It is not felt that this restriction and the delay incident thereto would unduly affect the operations of the Navy.

It is manifest from the Secretary's statement that the proposed legislation, while restoring the authority of Congress and returning to the principle of checks and balances, would do no violence to the practical workings of the Surplus Property Act.

The proposed legislation causes little inconvenience or delay to the Navy Department and, on the other hand, would serve as a strong shield for the Navy Department against any criticism being directed by the Congress for any disposition of a naval war facility. Congress will be acquainted with the facts prior to the disposition, and in a position to act where the situation warrants. Consequently, the provisions of the bill should tend to assure the public and to eliminate any ill-informed or irresponsible criticism of the Navy Department.

In concluding my statement, I want to refer briefly to the third principal reason for enactment of the bill—to insure Congress receiving notice in an orderly manner of the proposed dispositions.

To illustrate the importance of Congress having knowledge of proposed disposition of naval war facilities before the disposition is effected, I should like to

point out the situation as to foreign claims.

In every country where there have been American military forces, there are naturally claims against the United States. Many of these claims will be recognized by the United States. Doubtless they will be paid in money worth 100 cents on the dollar when directly settled by the United States.

At the end of the war these same countries may, perhaps, purchase some of our ships or some of our naval installations located in the particular country. Doubtless, the country may desire to purchase these war facilities on credit, or pay for them in greatly depreciated currency.

Congress should surely be advised of any case where it is contemplated that a foreign country is to be sold any of our naval war facilities, and under this bill the Congress will be so notified. The Congress will then have an opportunity to determine, and, I believe, will find out, whether or not the transaction is so connected with settlement of claims in that country that the government of the country will reimburse us at least in part by settling claims arising therein against the United States, rather than by giving us a promissory note or depreciated currency for a facility while we settle claims in the country with American cash.

In closing, I want to warn that any consideration of the declaration and disposal of major naval property is premature at this time. We cannot possibly know what is surplus until the size of our postwar fleet is determined.

Certainly this determination cannot be made in the midst of the greatest naval war in history. We do not know how great our naval losses will be before Japan is defeated.

Consequently, we do not know how large our fleet will be after these losses. And the complements of the postwar fleet cannot be determined until those losses have been sustained and Japan has been defeated.

H. R. 3180 is insurance against unwise and hasty disposals until the time when these decisions can be made with greater certainty. To repeat again for emphasis and clarity, this bill takes no authority from the Navy Department or the Surplus Property Board to either declare or dispose of surplus property. It grants to Congress only a reviewing authority over the declarations by the Navy Department that certain major naval property is surplus to its needs.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. This may seem like a trivial inquiry, but we hear all types of rumors. May I ask the gentleman if he knows whether or not the Navy has already disposed of a large number of the smaller boats at a nominal sum?

Mr. VINSON. This bill does not have application to what are known as fishing boats. They are returned. It has no application to any boat under 1,000 tons. All boats under 1,000 tons can be disposed of by the Secretary of the Navy without reporting to the Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. Has that been done?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; a great many of them have been disposed of.

Mr. REED of New York. What about a gasoline-operated boat 50 or 60 feet long?

Mr. VINSON. If it is under 1,000 tons, under this bill it can be disposed of.

Mr. REED of New York. How small a sum does the gentleman think they would accept for some of those boats?

Mr. VINSON. I do not have the slightest idea.

Mr. REED of New York. I believe the gentleman would be astounded if he were to make some inquiries about it.

Mr. VINSON. I know I would. All I am trying to do, I may say to the learned gentleman from New York, is to give him and me and other Members of Congress a voice over the disposition of the property of the Navy, and to find out something about it without reading it in the newspapers or listening to the rumors.

Mr. REED of New York. I happen to be on the committee that deals with taxation. I believe it is of great importance to this House and to the people of the country that we see that the taxpayer's money is not wasted when it comes to the disposal of this surplus property.

Mr. VINSON. To be fair with the gentleman, I say to him that we do not disturb the Surplus Property Board. We only say that when the owning agency, the Navy Department, has reached a decision that a vessel over 1,000 tons is surplus, it merely writes a letter to the Speaker of the House and states that the Navy considers it is surplus to its needs. Then it is up to the Congress to determine within 60 days whether or not it will adhere or disagree to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. REED of New York. Let me say that there are literally hundreds of millions of dollars invested in boats and other articles that are below the figure that is set.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, that is true.

Mr. REED of New York. That money ought to be saved, if possible.

Mr. VINSON. We had to draw a line somewhere. We did not want to get bogged down on everything. The Navy Department said that this line is probably the correct line.

This is not a Navy Department bill. This bill did not originate in the Navy Department. We do not have the approval of the Budget on this bill because I, as a Member of Congress, feel that I do not have to go down to the Budget and ask whether or not I shall introduce and advocate on the floor of the House specific legislation. Has the time come in the affairs of this Congress when it hesitates to legislate until it receives the approval of Mr. Smith down in the Budget? What are we here for? Are we here merely to follow the dictates of the Bureau of the Budget or are we here to do some independent thinking and some legislating on our own merits? Of course the Budget has not expressed any opinion on this bill because we did not ask it. We did not ask the Budget whether or not the Congress has the authority to legislate.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want the gentleman to know that I favor the legislation.

Mr. VINSON. I know the gentleman does. He is a good champion of it because he wants to have a voice in determining the size of the United States Navy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; and in preserving that Navy.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under the surplus-property law, the Surplus Property Board, under Mr. Gillette, passes upon a lot of these questions. What I understand this bill seeks to do is to give Congress the right to pass upon property that is declared by the Navy to be surplus.

Mr. VINSON. That is all it does. It does nothing else.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I cannot understand the attitude, if there is objection here, expressed by my friend from Mississippi, who desires that property, after the Navy Department declares it to be surplus, go direct to Mr. Gillette's board for that board to pass on it.

Mr. VINSON. That is right, exactly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman's bill proposes that the matter come to Congress and gives us 60 days to say whether or not that disposition of the property of the United States is wise.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly right.

May I ask my distinguished friend, does he not think if we had the responsibility of providing billions and billions of dollars to acquire this property, should we not therefore have equal responsibility in the disposition of it?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This is a matter of some concern to me. I have received a good many letters about it, and I have talked to many people back home about it. Last fall we were talking about having \$100,000,000,000 of surplus property. There can be a lot of scandals coming out of the disposition of \$100,000,000,000 worth of property. But here we place a double check on this disposition, not only with the Congress, but then it would go to Mr. Gillette.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. It is to the interest of the Navy to have a review by the Congress. In that connection, may I cite what Mr. Hensel, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who has cognizance over property disposition in the Navy, said. He said the following:

The bill is sound and will not interfere unduly with the administration of the Navy Department.

Of course, the Navy Department did not send this bill up to us. It originated in the Committee on Naval Affairs. It is carrying out the sentiment of the Congress as was expressed in the Mott-Magnuson amendment. Of course, we did not call in representatives of the Surplus Property Board. Why? Because we do not deal with the question of the disposition of surplus material. We only deal with what the Navy declares is surplus in a review capacity with the right of

veto. Now, what could representatives of the Surplus Property Board have said? How could they aid us? We merely step in between the Surplus Property Board and the Navy Department. We do not have anything to do with the functions of the Surplus Property Board. We leave the actual disposals to the Surplus Property Board. But we do say before the Navy-declared surplus goes to the door of the Surplus Property Board it must stop in at the door of Congress for 60 days for Congress to review it.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Is this not going to bring back to the Congress the problem we tried to dispose of through the Surplus Property Act? Let me give an example. The Navy Department sends out a list of 25 or 30 plants and property, that is outside of battleships and other vessels. It sends down a list of 25 or 30 pieces of property and facilities that they operate in various districts in the country and suggest closing and disposal of that property or facility. Immediately people in the districts begin to come here and ask for a continuation of those properties or facilities. The people want them to continue to function. Is that not going to bring a terrible situation to the Congress?

Mr. VINSON. Let us assume it does. If Congress has not the backbone to discharge its duty for the good of the Nation, then it is a bad situation.

Mr. BONNER. It is not a question of backbone. But does the gentleman not think there are those in the Navy Department who are trained for the purpose who have better judgment as to the operation of some plant out in the State of Washington than the Members of Congress from districts along the Atlantic coast?

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman from North Carolina believe that if they make their case the Congress would be guided by that superior knowledge and justification for the retention of it?

Mr. BONNER. I am merely bringing this up so that the question can be debated, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We do not take away the judgment of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct. We do not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But by this bill we have the judgment of the Navy, the judgment of the Congress, and then if it is approved it goes to the Surplus Property Administrator.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from North Carolina is apprehensive that after the Navy declares the property to be surplus and it comes to the Congress, there would be a hesitancy on the part of Congress to take it out of his district or out of my district or out of your district. For that reason, it is claimed it will be saddled on the Government. In reply to that, I will say if Congress is of that temperament we are in bad shape.

Mr. BONNER. It is not a question of individuals. But a group will be formed to maintain certain facilities here and there.

Mr. VINSON. My observation in reply to that is that groups have been formed, not only in Congress, but out of Congress. I have seen Congress responding to group pressure in its legislation for 30 years. I know of no way to keep group legislation from coming before the Congress. I think the gentleman is apprehensive about something which will not develop.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. LEMKE. May I suggest that so far as group pressure goes, a good many times groups are right and more American than some of the things we have in some of the departments.

Mr. VINSON. I agree with the gentleman. That is why I vote with a few groups.

Mr. LEMKE. I wish to congratulate the gentleman that he has brought this issue to the floor and that the Congress is again going to assume its responsibility of writing the Nation's laws.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. LEMKE. But I object to one thing, although not seriously. I do not think your bill goes far enough. I do not know why any department should ever be allowed to sell any of the national defense or give it away without affirmative action on the part of Congress.

Mr. VINSON. Until the Second War Powers Act of Congress not a foot of soil, not a Government facility of any kind could be sold without specific act of Congress. To supplement this we passed a law on August 28, 1940, saying that nothing could be sold unless the Congress had a voice in it. The act of July 9, 1940, reads:

No vessel, ship, or boat—except ships' boats—now in the United States Navy or being built or hereafter built therefor shall be disposed of by sale or otherwise, or be chartered or scrapped, except as now provided by law.

The only permission by which they could dispose of it is to declare it an obsolete vessel and mark it off as unfit for service.

In the act of 1943:

Hereafter any ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock of the Navy may be leased in accordance with the act approved March 11, 1941, but not otherwise disposed of, for periods not beyond the termination of the present wars, but title thereto shall remain in the United States.

Again Congress reasserted itself and said you could not dispose of this property without consulting Congress and passing laws. Yet what happened? All of these laws were nullified by the Surplus Property Act. Now, let us see what it did.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. VINSON. Just wait a minute. Section 34 reads as follows:

The authority conferred by this act is in addition to any authority conferred by any other law and shall not be subject to the provisions of any law inconsistent herewith. This act shall not impair or affect any authority for the disposition of property under any other law, except that the Board may prescribe regulations to govern any dispo-

sition of surplus property under any such authority to the same extent as if the disposition were made under this act, whenever it deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this act.

That section 34 erased from the books every one of the laws that Congress in the last 4 years had thrown around the Navy to protect it so that you and the other Representatives of Congress might have a voice in carrying out the maintenance of the Navy.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Instead of repealing it or modifying it, does not the language say that this act shall not impair or affect any authority? Instead of repealing it, it remains in force.

Mr. VINSON. May I say it does not remain in force, because it has been interpreted that all of the prior acts are nullified, and that is the very reason this bill is here today.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi and the membership to the fact that there is absolutely no doubt as to the interpretation of that provision of the Surplus Property Act, because in one of the most careful hearings we have ever had before the Committee on Naval Affairs, the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy interpreted the act exactly as the chairman has stated it, that the Surplus Property Act wiped out all of the laws previously passed for the disposition of naval property. There is no doubt about that at all.

Mr. VINSON. The issue stated by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] is clear cut. We do not interfere with the disposition of surplus property. We leave that alone. We do not interfere with the Navy declaring anything surplus. We only say, "Mr. Secretary Forrestal, Admiral King, when you declare this as surplus, we think the representatives of the American people whose money bought it should be informed, and we think you should submit that in proper form to the Speaker of the House to acquaint the Congress, and let the Congress have 60 days to make up its mind whether it agrees with you or not."

What is wrong about that? Where is the Member of Congress who can find objection to that? Is it not sound? Is it not fair? What are we here for? Are we here merely to do what the Budget says for us to do? I am not. I am here to do the best I know how, guided by my conscience. If I run counter to the Budget, if I run counter by not sending them these bills and asking their approval, it is because I feel keenly that I have a responsibility to discharge. I think the Committee on Naval Affairs unanimously endorses the view I am stating here, and I regret that my distinguished friend from Mississippi, for whom I have the highest regard and who has done a magnificent amount of work on the Surplus Property Act, finds himself in disagreement with the unanimous viewpoint of the Committee on

Naval Affairs in asking only that the Congress have an opportunity not to declare the surplus, not to deal with the disposal of the property, but merely a period of 60 days within which to review the findings of the Navy Department as to its surplus.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back what time I did not use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, before discussing this bill, H. R. 3180, since there seems to be some confusion as to just what its purpose is and how it comes to be before us now, I think perhaps a short statement of its background may be of value in our consideration of it.

You will recall that last year in the Seventy-eighth Congress when the Surplus Property Disposal bill was up for consideration I offered an amendment to that bill, which was modified to some extent by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I concurred in the modifications, and the amendment as modified read as follows:

Notwithstanding any of the provisions of any other law and regardless of any order, directive, or declaration designating any naval property as surplus pursuant to the provisions of any law, no naval combat vessel, base, station, or establishment shall be sold, leased, transferred, assigned, or otherwise disposed of unless the Congress shall by law specifically authorize the same.

That amendment was thoroughly debated upon two separate days, and it finally was adopted unanimously by the House. It went over to the Senate and the Senate accepted the amendment exactly as the House had adopted it. Then it went to conference and in conference something happened. It is not clear to me, and no explanation was ever made to the House, what outside forces intervened to change an amendment which had already been agreed to by both the House and Senate. The fact is, however, that the conference committee scuttled this amendment and sent the bill back without the amendment. Instead of this amendment the conference committee wrote a substitute amendment which simply excluded from the definition of naval property, battleships, aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, and which permitted all other naval property, including destroyer escorts, mine sweepers, floating drydocks, auxiliary vessels of all kinds, shore stations, naval bases, naval air stations, and the entire remainder of the Naval Establishment, to be sold, leased, transferred or otherwise disposed of by the executive agencies of the Government without the consent of Congress.

This was an unwarranted usurpation of jurisdiction by the conference committee and it was in violation of the rules of both the House and Senate. I therefore opposed the conference report and voted against it. The outside influence which brought about the scuttling of the amendment still prevailed, however, and the conference report was adopted.

I afterwards introduced this same amendment in the shape of a bill, and a number of other bills upon the same subject and kindred subjects were also introduced and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs subsequently introduced the bill now before us. It is a very comprehensive bill having to do with the entire question of disposal of surplus naval property and it includes the safeguards which the amendment I have referred to sought to throw around the disposal of naval property.

Preferably I would require affirmative action on the part of the Congress before any major naval property could be disposed of. A majority of the committee, however, was of the opinion that exclusive affirmative action on the part of the Congress, such as the amendment proposed, is not indispensable in every case and that a veto power vested in the Congress in the matter of disposition of the naval property specified in this bill is all that is required to recapture the jurisdiction of the Congress in this field and to properly protect the Naval Establishment. That is what the pending bill provides. It now comes to the House with the unanimous approval of our committee and I urge its immediate enactment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been very carefully drawn. Extensive hearings have been held on it and, as I have stated, it comes out of the Naval Affairs Committee with a unanimous favorable report, signed by every member of the committee—Democrat and Republican alike. That is the background of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, in my opinion, will adequately protect the United States Navy, it will protect the constitutional jurisdiction of the Congress over the Navy, and it will not interfere in anywise with administration of the Navy Department or the Surplus Property Board in disposing of property that is actually surplus.

Let us briefly refer now to the history of the Naval Establishment.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. If I am wrong, I want the gentleman to correct me. As I recall it, some years ago, at the beginning of the present World War and before America became a belligerent, the Navy, upon the recommendation of the Naval Affairs Committee, built a number of PT boats; is that correct?

Mr. MOTT. That is correct.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Sometime after that, that is after we had built a number of those PT boats, an attempt was made to turn them over to another country and it was only after the attention of the authorities was called by members of the gentleman's committee to the existence of one of these laws prohibiting that being done, a law now repealed, that the transfer of those PT boats was stopped, is that correct?

Mr. MOTT. That is correct. That was before the lend-lease law was enacted. I may say that the Naval Affairs Committee on many occasions and over a period of many years has found itself

obliged to step in and stop the disposal of small vessels and other property which the committee thought should be retained. And the Congress has always supported the committee in such instances.

The Naval Affairs Committee has been jealous of its jurisdiction. It has been very careful in its work, and it has been independent, nonpolitical, and nonpartisan. As the distinguished chairman of the committee stated a moment ago in his most excellent address, the Naval Affairs Committee has never felt itself obliged to take the word of the Budget Director or of anyone else as to what the Navy required. It has been our custom to call in the responsible naval officers, the chiefs of bureaus, and those who operate and maintain the fleet, to find out what they thought the Navy required, and then, after most exhaustive hearings, to authorize the construction or acquisition of whatever property we found to be necessary, whether the Budget liked it or not, and in every instance of that kind, let me say the Naval Affairs Committee has also been supported by the House of Representatives and by the Congress.

The Naval Establishment of the United States is a much bigger thing and a more important thing than many people realize. It has taken us 150 years to build up this Navy, all under the jurisdiction of the Congress. The Constitution of the United States vests in the Congress alone the responsibility of providing and maintaining a Navy. In the last 10 years the Congress has authorized and we have built, not only the greatest Navy in the world, but a Navy larger and stronger than all of the navies of the world combined. Personally, Mr. Chairman, I want to keep the Navy that way. I want it to be larger than all the rest of the navies of the world. I believe that we require such a Navy now and in the future, and I believe that if we had had such a Navy in 1941 we would never have been attacked at Pearl Harbor. No nation on earth would ever have dared to attack us. I believe if we maintain that Navy no nation in the future and no combination of nations will ever dare attack the United States, because such an attack would be futile, and any sensible nation must know that it could not possibly succeed.

It may be that at some time in the future, depending upon the outcome of a world organization to preserve and maintain peace for the success of which we all fervently hope and pray, we may find it advisable and safe to diminish to some extent the size of our Navy. But if and when that time shall come I want that vital question to be decided not by the President of the United States alone, and not by the Navy Department alone—great as is the respect I have for them both. I want the question whether the size of the Navy shall be diminished, and to what extent, to be decided in the last instance by the representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States, where the Constitution itself vests it and where the enactment of this bill will restore it.

Some question has been raised about the language of the report of the Secre-

tary of the Navy on this bill. I would like to inform the Members, Mr. Chairman, that during the extensive hearings on the bill we had no single witness from the Navy Department who offered any material objection to the bill, and I am very sure that there is no one in the naval establishment who personally has any objection to this bill at all. If it were otherwise the Secretary would have said so plainly in his report to the committee.

What does the bill do? In the first place it disregards small, minor naval property. It has to do only with the specific major naval property which is listed in the bill and the committee report. It has to do, aside from battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers and submarines, which are already protected by an amendment to the Property Disposal Act and specifically exempted and excluded from the provisions of that act. This bill has to do with floating drydocks, mine vessels, patrol vessels, auxiliaries, landing ships or district craft of 1,000 tons or more, Navy yards, naval air fields, naval training stations, naval ordnance plants and depots, naval installations, and Government-owned plants producing articles, materials or supplies for the Navy, except the so-called scramble plants. I wish to make it plain that it deals only with major naval property.

Now, what is the situation under the present Surplus Property Disposal Act in respect to this major naval property? Through the years we have built up not only a great navy but a great body of law relative to the composition and maintenance of the Navy. That body of law specifically states how and under what conditions and circumstances and by what methods naval property may be disposed of. We have been operating under that body of law for years, under some of it for nearly 100 years, and the Congress has perfected it as it has deemed necessary from time to time. The Congress has always retained complete jurisdiction not only of the composition but also of the disposition of the Naval Establishment.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress, however, there was introduced the Surplus Property Disposal Act, which wiped out and obliterated every vestige of statutory law that had ever been passed relative to the disposition of naval property save only battleships, carriers, destroyers, and submarines. Now, under that act, the Navy Department, if it desires to do so, unless this bill, H. R. 3180, is passed, can at any time it pleases declare any other naval vessel, any navy yard, any naval establishment, any naval air station, any training station, or any Navy-owned manufacturing plant, either in continental United States or in any other part of the world, to be surplus, and turn it over to be sold to any person or any foreign nation it pleases without obtaining the consent of the Congress, and without even consulting the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, which gives the Congress a veto on the disposition

of major naval property, simply provides that when the Navy Department declares surplus any of this property, it must report it to the Congress. In the House it is reported to the Speaker of the House and referred to the House Committee on Naval Affairs, which proceeds to examine the proposal to dispose of this property.

Probably in 9 out of 10 of these proposals for disposition of surplus property no question would arise at all. It would simply require a waiting period of 60 days, or, under the language of the act, if in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy a more rapid disposition of the surplus property was desired, the Congress could then take immediate affirmative action. It could do it by introducing a concurrent resolution and putting it on the Consent Calendar, so that surplus property over which there was plainly no dispute could be disposed of almost immediately.

However, in case the Navy Department should declare to be surplus a major naval installation, such as a naval air station, perhaps at Guam or on Saipan or on the Pacific coast or some other place, and the Surplus Property Board should want to dispose of it, then before that could be done the proposal to dispose of such a naval base, only if an auxiliary naval vessel or a floating drydock, as the case may be, would have to be reported to the Congress. Then if the Congress, after a thorough examination, objected to the disposal of that property, it could take affirmative action and introduce a concurrent resolution prohibiting the disposition of that property. Under the bill it would have 60 days within which to do this.

As the chairman said, in response to some of the observations of the gentleman from Mississippi, I do not see how any Member of Congress can logically object to this bill, which after all is only a partial recapture of the complete jurisdiction of the Congress over naval property which we have exercised for more than 100 years but which the Congress surrendered to the executive agencies of the Government in the enactment of the Surplus Property Disposal Act. In doing this the Congress made a grave mistake which an overwhelming majority of its Members now admit was a mistake. The sole purpose of this bill is to correct that mistake. Let there be no more time wasted in doing it.

May I conclude, Mr. Chairman, with a word of appreciation and gratitude to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for his insistence upon bringing out this sound and imperative measure, and his determination to fight it through against any opposition which might arise. The Nation owes a debt to the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, which it can only repay by heeding his wise counsel and by keeping inviolate the great Navy which he has been so outstandingly instrumental in creating. It was an unhappy day for the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, and for the entire committee of which it is my great privilege to be the ranking minority member, when a majority of the Congress consented to a surrender of an important

part of its jurisdiction over the Navy. The enactment of this bill, which now comes to the House bearing the name of this great American as its author, will recapture that jurisdiction, and will safeguard and protect that mighty establishment so dear to the hearts of all of us, which is, which always was, and which always will be the first line of our national security, the Navy of the United States.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee has made a full and complete exposition of the bill, and the report of the committee, which by the way, is one of the best reports I have ever seen, concisely and definitely answers every question that might be asked. I wish therefore to make a few preparatory remarks indicative of the reasons for the legislation.

Hector Bywater, the great English naval writer, said in 1927: "Now as never before, the dominion of the sea is vested in the strongest fleet." He used the word "fleet" as meaning the whole naval force of a country. He also meant a proper balance of ships of all types and classifications. His statement may have presaged the present conflict when naval warfare must be on all the waters that cover the globe. The United States has gone further than any other country in that conception, and, as said in the report of the committee "today the United States Navy is larger than the combined navies of all other nations, and much stronger than any combination of foreign navies which could be brought against us." Such a navy is not only our strongest defense, but now as never before it is absolutely essential to our offense.

Such a thought is new—it has arisen from the nature of the warfare of the present day. One hundred and fifty years ago, it was the view of the people of this country that we needed no naval force at all. The War of 1812 disabused them of such an idea as utter naval helplessness. The succeeding years showed the need of a navy and in World War I and afterward we were engaged in a great naval building program which as President Roosevelt in a message to Congress in 1927 said, "before its completion would have given us first place on the sea." All of you know that our deliberate self-denial in the limitation of armament caused us to lose our position as to naval strength. Japan violated her sacred oath to disarm made at the Washington Conference almost as soon as the ink of her signature dried on the pages of the treaty. Disarmament became a delightful dream so far as peace was concerned. Still there were those among us who, though having eyes, refused to see the dangers across the waters to the east and west of us. Some time ago I read a short paragraph of three sentences—I do not know the author—but it is so concise and complete in pointing out the dangers of inattention to the upkeep of the Navy that I will insert it here.

There has been, after each of the wars in which we have been engaged, and coincident with the relaxing of the war tension, a waning interest in the Navy. In recent years

this has been furthered by an organized pacifist propaganda, working both upon the country's inherent idealism and upon the desire for economy, and having as its object disarmament by example. In the conditions now confronting us this weakening of our first line of defense is a menace to the country's security.

It is evident we have won the war, even though we are still fighting, and surely no observer anywhere will fail to give credit to the Navy for the part it played. Speaking for myself, I am of the opinion that not only did our Navy afford a sense of security and protection to the people of the country in its defensive work but also, in its offensive operations, made it possible for our glorious armies to give the knock-out blow. Yet in our indifference to international conditions we had, after the Washington Conference and until 1932, not even kept the Navy up to the treaty strength permitted in the treaty signed at Washington. The United States Navy had sunk to a level of a third-rate navy. By the grace of God, this danger was foreseen by some far-sighted leaders of America and we began in 1933—slowly, it is true, but surely—to build up the Navy that it might be prepared for any unforeseen eventuality. It takes time to build a navy and the work done in those few years before the dastardly blow struck us was of such value, small though the Navy was as compared with its strength now, that I believe it kept our shores from enemy invasion. The lesson of unpreparedness was forcibly brought home to us and we energetically and feverishly began to build and accomplished the greatest production in a short period of time that the world has ever known. The work has been done successfully. We must make sure that never again will we be caught in such a precarious unpreparedness. No man knows what will be the after conditions of this war while we are striving so hard to bring peace to the war-worn, weary world.

This bill has as its main purpose to put before the people of the country the need for keeping up to its full adequate strength the Navy, as it now is, and, secondarily, to move slowly in the disposal of surplus ships and property which have accumulated in the years of our large production. Following the American system of checks and balances, the committee thought the disposal of such unnecessary ships, equipment, and material should have the approval of Congress after consideration of the recommendations of the naval administration.

It is the declared duty of Congress under the Constitution "to provide and maintain a Navy." This bill, again quoting from the report of the committee, "is a recognition that the branch of Government which has had the responsibility of appropriating billions of the taxpayers' money for constructing the greatest Navy known to history, likewise has the responsibility for seeing that this huge investment in security is not dissipated by unwise dispositions."

This bill is not intended as an interference with the operations of the Navy. The control and command of the Navy is left just as it should be, in the hands of those best qualified to direct it. The

committee, however, thinks that Congress should be advised of the maintenance of the Navy in order that it should fulfill its constitutional responsibility. This is recognized by the able and hard-working Secretary of the Navy in his letter to the committee of May 2, 1945, in which he says, that, while it may slow up some of the disposal activities, "it is not felt that this restriction and delay incident thereto would unduly affect the operations of the Navy."

In the great emergency that confronted the United States prior to and at the breaking out of the war, Congress realized the necessity for speedy action which could not have been obtained under the slower processes of legislation, and it delegated to the executive department broad powers of action. This bill again reviews the situation, and the committee thinks the time has come to enact legislation to limit that extensive authority previously granted.

The Navy Department, under the bill, cannot dispose of any ships, shore stations, or plants except under the definitions and restrictions mentioned in the bill without first reporting to Congress. Congress then can approve or disapprove said proposal by a concurrent resolution or take no action at all, in which case the Navy may carry out its ideas after 60 days.

This is proper necessary legislation, and should be approved by the House.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to preface my remarks by paying a personal tribute to the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON. I know of no man in the country who deserves more in the way of gratitude for the remarkable job that has been done in building up our Navy. CARL VINSON for the past quarter century has served as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. He fought for a big Navy when fighting for a big Navy was unpopular, and he deserves the thanks of not only the Navy and the Congress but of the entire country for his foresight and tenacity of purpose.

Mr. Chairman, we, of the Naval Affairs Committee, feel that H. R. 3180 is good and timely legislation. Its implications, both general and specific, are fundamental in our constitutional form of government. It will be a recapture of constitutional authority to provide and maintain a Navy, heretofore surrendered to the executive branch of Government.

The specific aspects of the bill with respect to disposal of naval property are probably of greater interest to the Committee on Naval Affairs because of its specific authority and responsibility in acting in behalf of the House. But the general aspects of the bill are of prime importance to every member of the House, for this bill is a landmark of congressional reclamation of authority and reaffirmance of responsibility.

TREND OF GOVERNMENT BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

For several years there has been a trend for Congress to delegate too much of its authority and responsibility to the

executive department. Administrative law has been in its fullest bloom. Government by Executive orders, rules, and regulations, has flourished. True, war emergencies and the necessity of speed on detailed matters have greatly justified this trend. But the trend went too far.

Yes, the trend went so far that Congress has begun consideration of streamlining itself in order to make itself a more effective and efficient arm of the Government. This comparison of "more effective and efficient" was made with the executive department to whom the Congress had delegated so much of its power.

The time has come for Congress to reassert itself—to stop playing second fiddle to the executive branch—and the passage of H. R. 3180 is a good way to start the ball rolling.

While the modernization of Congress is desirable, it will mean little if Congress does not restore to itself much of that power which it gave to the executive department, and which delegated power, ironically enough, has done much to make the executive department appear to be more efficient and virile than Congress.

We must concentrate on the substance rather than the form—and the power which we must recapture is the substance—for modernizing and streamlining is nothing more than form, and this bill is directed at the substance.

H. R. 3180 proposes to restore in Congress a veto voice over the disposal of naval property by the executive department, but, as viewed by the Secretary of the Navy, it would not unduly affect the operation of the Navy. The Navy Department considers the bill to be workable in the line of demarcation that it draws between the spheres of participation of the Congress and the executive department in the surplus-property disposal program.

I believe that H. R. 3180 may well set the pattern for Congress to follow in other important matters. It is a guide in the renaissance of Congress.

SPECIFIC INTEREST OF EACH MEMBER

I spoke of the general interest of each Member of Congress in this bill's objective of proper restoration of power to Congress. I now direct your attention to the appendix of the committee report on the bill, for I believe that it will suggest a specific interest to many of you. These major naval war facilities are distributed in locations throughout the country. They are in many congressional districts.

It is only proper that you be informed of any proposed disposal of a major naval war facility in your district. You are entitled to this information, as such disposals will vitally affect the people of your district. This bill would guarantee to you that information through concurrent resolution before, and not after, proposed disposals.

MIDDLE-COURSE LEGISLATION

Those of you who served in the Seventy-eighth Congress will recall that the House adopted the Mott-Magnuson amendment to the surplus-property bill after full debate and by unanimous vote. Briefly, the Mott-Magnuson amendment

would have prohibited any disposal of combat naval vessels, naval stations, and establishments without an affirmative act of Congress.

The conference report of the surplus-property bill narrowed the field over which Congress would retain power as to disposal of naval property by striking the Mott-Magnuson amendment and merely excluding from the definition of property under the bill battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines. As the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] stated, the "conference committee scuttled" his amendment and reported back a bill that allowed the disposal agency to dispose of any naval station, base, or establishment without the consent of Congress and without even consulting Congress.

This bill, H. R. 3180, goes to neither extreme, but rather pursues a middle course. Unlike the Mott-Magnuson amendment it does not require affirmative acts of the Congress for the disposal of naval property by the executive department. The bill would leave the initial decisions in the determination and disposal of surplus property to the executive department.

It gives full recognition to the importance of surplus-property disposal as it is very carefully designed to avoid interference with the surplus-property-disposal program—even to the extent of attempting to avoid any impractical delays resulting from the 60-day waiting period by providing for authorization of disposals considered to require expeditious action by the Secretary of the Navy, through affirmative concurrent resolution of both Houses.

At the same time it makes it possible for Congress to review the question as to whether the important naval vessels and facilities, within the purview of the legislation, are, in fact, surplus to the defense needs of the United States.

IN KEEPING WITH CONGRESSIONAL POLICY AND PRECEDENT

Unfortunately, in the broad legislation of the Lend-Lease Act and the Surplus Property Act, primarily designed for objectives other than the preservation of the fighting strength of the Navy, too broad an unreviewed responsibility was delegated to the executive department, insofar as it related to disposal of important naval vessels, bases, plants, and other war facilities.

Under the Lend-Lease Act, important units could be disposed of under such a broad authority that the Naval Affairs Committee recommended, and Congress enacted the act of February 19, 1943, restricting the disposal of naval vessels.

Under the Surplus Property Act, excepting only the major units of the fighting fleet, the Congress virtually relinquished control of large numbers of vital Navy units, and made it possible for the fighting strength of the postwar Navy to be seriously impaired by disposals concerning which Congress may know nothing until the ship or facility has passed from the ownership of the United States.

In keeping with the congressional policy and precedent established in the act of February 19, 1943, it is again necessary to review the situation and to enact lim-

iting legislation for the authority granted under the Surplus Property Act, just as it was previously necessary in the case of the Lend-Lease Act. Such legislation would be provided by the enactment of H. R. 3180.

SUMMARY

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass H. R. 3180 because:

First. The provisions of the bill, which would insure that the Congress will have notice of, and opportunity to consider, all proposed declarations of surplus and disposal of the various naval plants and naval stations, and the more important naval units, would restore the constitutional system of checks and balances between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, by providing Congress opportunity to exercise an effective veto voice in their disposition;

Second. It guarantees full knowledge to Congress, as a whole, of the proposed disposals of major naval property, and to the individual Members knowledge of proposed disposals within their districts, prior to and not after the disposals have been made;

Third. It does not saddle the Navy Department with any undue burdens, as the Navy Department considers the bill to be workable in the line of demarcation that it draws between the spheres of participation of the Congress and the executive department in the surplus-property disposal program; and

Fourth. It is a guide for further congressional reclamation of authority and reaffirmance of responsibility heretofore delegated to the executive department during the crisis of war on a scale far too broad for normal peacetime operations.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, as I previously stated when the rule was before the House for consideration, this bill really nullifies the material provisions of the Surplus Property Act insofar as Navy property is concerned. It is intended to and does and will, if the policy here announced is pursued by other departments of the Government, mean the absolute destruction of the Surplus Property Act.

The Surplus Property Act was passed in the latter part of 1944, the administrators have been appointed, and thus far neither in the report of the committee or in the hearings is there any evidence whatsoever that the Navy has been in anywise impaired in the slightest degree by the operations of that act. If we had not passed the Surplus Property Act naval and other property would have been disposed of under an Executive order issued a year ago by the late President Roosevelt. Personally, I am for a big navy. I have always voted for an adequate army. I have never voted against any appropriation for the prosecution of the war submitted by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and my only inquiry has been whether or not that authorization was recommended by the

Navy Department and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. I know of no man who stood for a larger navy than the late President Roosevelt, and he, like the late President Wilson, asked Congress to make provision for the disposal of surplus war property.

As I have previously said, and with no desire to repeat, the Surplus Property Act was passed after the Postwar Planning Committee, of which my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], is the chairman, considered it, and after they recommended its adoption, after the Committee on Expenditures considered it, after the other body passed the Senate bill. After consideration for substantially 4 weeks in conference the Surplus Property Act was finally passed. It is not perfect. I did not favor some of the provisions of that act. I bowed to the majority of my colleagues. If there are any imperfections in that act with respect to naval property, with respect to any other departments' property, I submit the orderly way to do would be to amend the act. The bill under consideration does not amend anything. It merely delays, confuses, and nullifies, as I shall undertake to show.

The Surplus Property Act provides, and let there be no misunderstanding, that for combat vessels named in the identical language of the pending bill, there shall be no disposition. Secondly, under the Surplus Property Act all other property in the bill under consideration may be disposed of, mark my language, and under the pending bill all other property may be disposed of. Let us keep in mind that under the Surplus Property Act they are required to publish their rules and regulations in the Federal Register for the information of Congress. They are required to submit quarterly reports. If there is one agency of the Government that has advised the Congress of the United States as to the disposition of property, it has been the Surplus Property Administration.

Never a day passes but what there comes to the desk of every Member a category of the property that is to be disposed of. But that is not all. Under the terms of this act, in the disposition of this property, it is not generally necessary to come back to Congress; it is not necessary to maintain certain plants for indefinite periods in order to provide for their disposal. It has been rolled as a sweet morsel under the tongues of my good friends, whom I esteem highly, that the purpose of this bill is to restore the constitutional power of Congress, and yet under the terms of this bill every dollar's worth of property embraced in this bill might be disposed of without any action whatsoever by the Congress or the United States.

What about the constitutional prerogatives? It sounds nicely. Shall the Congress of the United States be converted into a disposal agency to undertake to dispose of the aluminum plants, to undertake to dispose of the steel plants? What do you or I know about naval installations? What do I know about what is required in the prosecution of the war except as it is recommended to me, and

as it is recommended to you by the Committee on Naval Affairs and by the Navy Department?

Under the terms of the pending bill, the coordinate authority of the more than 100 acts of Congress in the Surplus Property Administration would virtually be stymied insofar as the Navy is concerned.

It is said that the constitutional power of Congress is to be restored, yet there is not a mandatory provision in this bill that Congress shall take any action whatsoever before the property is disposed of. Shall the Congress of the United States undertake to dispose of the hundreds and thousands of items, the hundreds of plants, the hundreds of naval stations, the fifty to one hundred billions of dollars worth of property, item by item, station by station, and plant by plant?

We lay down the general rule, we lay down the standard. We have said that that property has to be disposed of for a fair price. We have said that when the Navy Department says there is a Navy war hospital that is no longer needed, that hospital shall be turned over to the Veterans' Administration. This bill delays and nullifies that provision. The transfer may be delayed. Wounded boys may be brought in here and have to wait for 60 days before that can be done.

It is emphasized in the report of the committee that the constitutional authority of Congress is to be restored. With all due deference, in all kindness, when did the Committee on Naval Affairs become so anxious about advising Congress of its constitutional powers?

My beloved friend, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, as I was about to ask him to do so, anticipated me and read section 34 of the Surplus Property Act, which section provides that no act is impaired and no act is repealed unless inconsistent with that act. I will read it again. This is section 34 (a):

The authority conferred by this act is in addition to any authority conferred by any other law and shall not be subject to the provisions of any law inconsistent therewith. This act shall not impair or affect any authority for the disposition of property under any other law, except that the Board may prescribe regulations to govern any disposition of surplus property under any such authority to the same extent as if the disposition were made under this act whenever it deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this act.

If the Navy Department has now the power to dispose of any property, all the Surplus Property Board can do is regulate the manner of disposal.

What about the constitutional prerogatives of Congress? I say that the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I say it without criticism, has been jealous to insist that there be no disposition of any vessel, and particularly of any naval station, any shore station, without the consent of that committee, but that great committee has not heretofore insisted on the Congress of the United States having its congressional prerogatives asserted. I call attention to the fact that the Committee on Naval Affairs has been frank. They have pointed out in their report on the purpose of the bill these laws that

are not impaired. They name the acts still in force on page 2 of their report.

I call attention to this, that, in my judgment—and I trust I speak fairly—the Committee on Naval Affairs has hedged about and prevented the disposal by the Surplus Property Board or by the Navy Department of property under that Department as has no other agency of the Government. The Committee on Naval Affairs has certainly protected its prerogatives. It did not insist on the protection of the prerogatives of Congress. It did not ask that the Navy Department get the consent of Congress to dispose of property of over \$2,000 in value or to acquire any land. It was jealous only of the prerogatives of the committee. The committee sees an opportunity for further delay by now asking passage of the pending bill. The Committee on Naval Affairs has provided that that committee be furnished more and detailed information with respect to surplus property than any other committee of the Congress. There is no reason for the passage of the pending bill, unless it is an invitation to other similar bills that will destroy the proper disposition of surplus property.

I refer to the act of June 28, 1940. That act requires, among other things, that the Navy Department, not with Congress but with the Committee on Naval Affairs, shall report within 24 hours after any contract for the disposal of any Navy equipment, or any supplies exceeding \$2,000—not to the Congress but to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Committee on Naval Affairs in the act cited in the report on the pending bill requires notice within 24 hours of any contracts for the disposal of Naval equipment or supplies of the value of more than \$2,000. If it is proposed to sell any property that would impair the Navy, surely the Naval Affairs Committee would have information, because they receive reports on all Naval equipment of over \$2,000. Again, under the existing laws still in force, because not in conflict with the Surplus Property Act, the Committee on Naval Affairs has secured the passage of a statute that actually provides that the Committee on Naval Affairs shall approve the acquisition or disposal of any land. The Committee on Naval Affairs was content not for Congress to approve, but for that Committee alone to approve or deny the Navy Department the acquisition or disposal of any land. The honeyed words of the Committee to protect Congressional prerogatives are condemned out of their own mouths, because no contract for acquiring or disposing of lands can be made by the Navy Department. The Navy Department must secure the approval, not of Congress, but of the Naval Affairs Committee alone.

My friends, the Committee on Naval Affairs, are human. These installations are located along the coast. They are located in the districts of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs. They are fine men. They are just as good colleagues as I have in the Congress. They are human just as I am. I know the pressure which is brought to bear on them and which is brought to bear on us to

maintain an army station or a naval station whether it is essential after the war or not. What is the substance and purpose of the bill under consideration? It is to prevent and further delay the disposal of plants that may cost \$5,000,000, \$1,000,000, or \$20,000,000. That is the vice of this bill. It was recommended as part of the reconversion program of the President of the United States that these plants be disposed of. This would further delay and further prevent the disposal of these plants in our reconversion from war to peace.

With respect to the prerogatives of Congress now proclaimed by the Committee on Naval Affairs, listen to me. I am not saying it in criticism. You have been on guard. The Committee on Naval Affairs under the act of April 4, 1944, mentioned their report on the pending bill, I think it was, and I will just give you the substance of it, it is just referred to by date in the report—mark my language—provides that before the Navy shall acquire or dispose by lease or otherwise any land, the Secretary of the Navy shall come into agreement with the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House with respect to such disposition or acquisition. Consistency is a jewel except with the Committee on Naval Affairs. Again I ask, What about the congressional prerogative?

That sweet morsel has repeatedly been emphasized by the members of the Naval Affairs Committee who have approved, without congressional action, land acquisitions and disposals.

I have some more matters with respect to the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress.

"No vessel, no ship, or boat shall be disposed of except as provided by law"—act of July 1940. It is still in force, and it is impaired by the Surplus Property Act.

My good friend, and I am not saying this in criticism, he has been fine, the chairman has admitted frankly if this bill passes it ought to be followed by a similar bill by the War Department; he has admitted it ought to be followed by similar bills by other departments of Government. It is a matter of common knowledge that the Surplus Property Act deals with fifty to one hundred millions of dollars of property of the Navy and the War Department under their supervision. If this bill is followed by bills for property under the supervision of the War Department, you might as well scrap the Surplus Property Act before it has even begun to be administered.

In this connection, under the unanimous consent already granted me in the House, I include in my remarks the report of the Secretary of War on the surplus-property bill, the letter dated August 7, 1944. I include at this point the favorable report of the Navy Department dated July 5, consisting of a memorandum from Capt. Lewis L. Strauss and a letter from Secretary Forrestal thereto attached, dated July 10, 1944, both of which say that the program which they endorsed and urged the speedy enactment of was in accordance with the policy and program of the President of the United States. They are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., August 7, 1944.
HON. CARTER MANASCO,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures
in the Executive Departments,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MANASCO: The War Department recommends the enactment of H. R. 5125, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes, upon which you have requested a report, subject to the amendment suggested below.

The War Department has consistently advocated the creation of a central agency in the Government to be charged with the authority and responsibility for the disposition of surplus property. The principal reason for the creation of a central agency, so far as the War Department is concerned, is that the Army is not now, and will not, after the war, be organized to undertake the merchandising of large amounts of surplus property. Aside from the lack of personnel and administrative organization for economic and commercial functions of this character, which are beyond the scope of War Department responsibilities, disposal of surplus property of the War Department is only a part, although a substantial part, of the problem of disposing of surplus property of all Federal agencies. A unified policy and coordinated administration with respect to the disposition of surplus property of every character and from every source is essential to eliminate competition among the agencies of the Government, to avoid discrimination between purchasers, and to properly carry out the policies established by Congress.

For these reasons, representatives of the War Department participated in drafting the proposed bill recently submitted to your committee and to other committees of the Congress by Mr. William L. Clayton, Surplus War Property Administrator. With the exception hereafter noted, H. R. 5125 embodies substantially the provisions of that proposed bill with certain amendments suggested by the Attorney General and others, with which the War Department is in agreement.

The War Department considers that H. R. 5125 embodies the best features of the numerous measures covering this subject which have been recently introduced.

The one provision of H. R. 5125 which was not contained in the bill proposed by the Surplus War Property Administrator, and to which the War Department has serious objections, is the provision in section 7 (a) to the effect that after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, the Surplus Property Administrator shall have power to require a determination by any owning agency that any property is surplus to its needs and responsibilities. The War Department considers that this division of authority is administratively impracticable, is inconsistent with the basic responsibility of the Department, and impinges upon the functions of the Congress. In time of peace, as well as war, the responsibility for the national defense rests upon the War and Navy Departments and the Congress. This responsibility necessarily carries with it the duty and authority to determine what weapons and equipment are necessary for war or defense. The programs developed by the military services are submitted to and approved by Congress in the appropriation acts. No agency outside of the military departments would have the knowledge or current developments in military science, of strategic plans, or of the changing scope of training requirements, to make sound decisions as to types or quantities of supplies and equipment which are required at any given time to properly meet the responsibility for preparedness. The authority of the War and Navy Departments to administer the programs for defense, under the control of Congress would in effect be nullified by the power which this section

would vest in the Surplus War Property Administrator.

For these reasons, the War Department urges that H. R. 5125 be amended by eliminating the last sentence of section 7 (a).

Subject to the elimination of this provision, the War Department believes that the prompt enactment of H. R. 5125 would materially assist and expedite the orderly disposition of surplus war property.

The War Department is unable to estimate the fiscal effect of enactment of this measure.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report, subject to the understanding that no commitment should be made at this time as to the relationship to the program of the President of each and every provision of this and the other bills in the surplus property disposal field that are now before the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Acting Secretary of War.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1944.

MEMORANDUM

From: Capt. L. L. Strauss.

To: The Secretary of the Navy.

Subject: Request of Chairman MANASCO for comment on H. R. 5082, H. R. 5119, and H. R. 5125, relating to the disposition of surplus property.

1. You have requested that I advise you with respect to the three bills attached to Chairman MANASCO's letter to you of June 29, 1944, H. R. 5082, H. R. 5119, and H. R. 5125, all of them relating to the disposition of surplus property and now under consideration in the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2. H. R. 5082 proposes a National Surplus Property Disposal Board of seven members, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board is to select its own chairman. In addition the Board is to appoint a Director of Surplus Property who is to be the actual administrator of the property-disposal program. The Board is also to appoint within each State or appropriate smaller district a board to exercise general supervision over property disposal in such State or district. The Director is required to catalog all surplus property, to establish price differentials for sales to ultimate users and for sales for resale purposes, and to fix resale prices. It is made unlawful to resell surplus property "for any price in excess of the allowable mark-up."

3. Supplies of all surplus items are to be allocated among the respective States on a population basis. Where the demand within any State is in excess of the quantity available, the State board is required to give preference, first to veterans, next to purchasers who desire to make purchases "for use in connection with their occupation or business," third, to nonprofit institutions, and fourth, to purchasers holding a certificate from the Smaller War Plants Corporation that the acquisition of the item will "significantly contribute to the success of a small-scale enterprise."

4. In my opinion H. R. 5082 is not a well-conceived measure, and I recommend that the Navy Department object to its enactment. The administrative overlapping between the national board, the Director of Surplus Property Disposal, and the State and district boards would make successful administration impossible. The requirements with respect to pricing, allocation, and preferences are unrealistic, and their net effect would be to nullify the purposes of the bill.

5. H. R. 5119 proposes to establish an Office of Surplus War Property headed by a Director appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The

functions of the Office are to centralize responsibility for the disposal of any type or class of property in a single agency, to exercise general supervision and direction of the surplus war property disposal program, and to require observance by the disposal agencies of three policies: To secure a maximum return, to discourage speculation, and to encourage sales to veterans for the establishment and maintenance of their own small businesses or farms.

6. The bill is very brief, and fails to grant necessary disposal authority, to set up sufficiently comprehensive administrative machinery, or to prescribe in sufficient detail the policies which should govern administration. In my judgment it is entirely inadequate to solve the problems it deals with. I recommend that the Navy Department should not approve enactment of this measure.

7. H. R. 5125 is apparently based upon the draft submitted at its request to the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee by W. L. Clayton, Surplus Property Administrator. The Clayton draft is printed in the report of the subcommittee dated June 5, 1944. It was prepared by a committee on which were represented all the agencies with a major interest in the procurement and disposal of Government property, including the Navy Department, and reflects the views of this office as to the requirement for sound surplus property disposal legislation.

8. H. R. 5125 vests responsibility for surplus property disposal in a Surplus Property Administration headed by a Surplus Property Administrator appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. He is to be assisted by a Surplus Property Advisory Board consisting of the heads of the various agencies most concerned with the procurement and disposal of property. A procedure for continuing congressional scrutiny of property disposal activities is provided. The owning agencies are authorized to dispose of certain types of properties which can best be disposed of by them without transfer to a central agency. The bulk of the surplus property, however, is to be disposed of by central disposal agencies designated by the Administrator, in accordance with the policies prescribed in the act and the regulations of the Administrator. Synthetic rubber and aluminum plants are to be withheld from sale until a disposal plan has been submitted to Congress. Provision is made for transfer of surplus property between agencies, for the disposition of the proceeds of transfers, and for necessary delegations of authority. While its administrative machinery is simple and elastic, the bill provides comprehensively for the problems of surplus property disposal.

9. In one important respect H. R. 5125 differs from the draft submitted by Mr. Clayton. Section 7 (a) of the bill provides that for the duration of hostilities in the present war each owning agency shall have the exclusive authority to determine which property is surplus to its needs, but thereafter the Administrator shall have power to require such a determination. The Clayton draft did not grant this function to the Administrator. I cannot speak for the other agencies, but it seems clear to me that the Navy Department's responsibility in peacetime to safeguard the national defense and to prepare for any emergency cannot be discharged successfully if an outside authority can determine that property which the Navy deems essential should be disposed of as surplus.

10. If section 7 (a) were changed to eliminate the objection mentioned above, the Navy Department should, in my judgment, strongly recommend the early enactment of H. R. 5125 as essential to a successful and orderly solution of the surplus war property disposal problem.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Captain, United States Naval Reserve.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, July 10, 1944.

HON. CARTER MANASCO,

Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in
the Executive Departments, House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN MANASCO: As requested in your letter of June 29, I am submitting herewith a report, prepared by Capt. L. L. Strauss, Assistant Chief of Procurement and Material for Industrial Readjustment, on the three property-disposal bills which you enclosed with your letter, to wit: H. R. 5982, H. R. 5119, and H. R. 5125. I concur with Captain Strauss' conclusions.

In view of your request that the report be submitted as soon as it was possible to put the comments of this Department in writing and transmit them to you, there has been no opportunity to secure a statement from the Bureau of the Budget as to whether this report is consistent with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

I have already asked permission to include in my remarks the report of the Secretary of the Navy on the pending bill, dated May 2, 1945. Something has been said about it not being necessary to advise Congress as to the attitude of the President and the Bureau of the Budget. I call attention to this fact, that you and I, the chairman of this committee, and the Members of Congress, have a right to initiate legislation. But unless the Secretary of the Navy, who endorsed it in writing urging the prompt and speedy passage of the Surplus Property Act, unless he means to bypass the Chief Executive of the United States, I respectfully submit that there would not be the omission in this latter incorporated in the report of the committee which was submitted to us of a statement with respect to the attitude and the views of the Bureau of the Budget. There is no statement whatever with respect to the attitude and the views of the Bureau of the Budget, in the said report which is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, May 2, 1945.

HON. CARL VINSON,

Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that you have requested the views of the Navy Department relative to H. R. 2894, a bill to impose certain restrictions on the disposition of naval vessels and facilities necessary to the maintenance of the combatant strength and efficiency of the Navy, and for other purposes.

The Navy is, of course, vitally interested in the maintenance of its combatant strength and efficiency which are essential for the defense of the country. Insofar as the purpose of the bill is to attain this result, it has the full support of the Navy Department.

One of the expressed purposes of the bill is to impose restrictions on the disposition of naval vessels and facilities. This would have the effect under certain circumstances of slowing up the disposal of property which the Navy had determined was surplus to its needs. Insofar as the disposal of such property is deferred, it will require the maintenance of that property by the Navy for that period. Maintenance is by its very nature expensive and funds will have to be provided by the Congress to permit that maintenance. If such funds are not provided, it might have the effect of retarding modernization and improvement of the Naval Establishment as a whole because other funds would have to be used. I am sure Congress is cognizant of these problems, and if the necessary appro-

priations are made available the maintenance, modernization, and improvement of the Naval Establishment will not be affected.

The requirement, as provided in section 4 of the bill, that "no naval war facility described in sections 1 (a) (2), (3), or (4) shall be sold, leased, donated, or otherwise disposed of to any person or to any political entity or governmental instrumentality, foreign or domestic, or be transferred from the jurisdiction or control of the Department of the Navy, or be determined to be surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the Department of the Navy, unless—

(a) the Secretary of the Navy has made a report to the Congress (while both Houses are in session) setting forth the reasons why such facility is no longer needed by the Department of the Navy; and

(b) sixty days have elapsed since the making of such report (not counting as part of such 60 days any period between the end of one session of Congress and the beginning of the next); and

(c) during such sixty days the Senate and House of Representatives have failed to pass a concurrent resolution stating in substance that such facility should be retained by the Department of the Navy.

will impose certain administrative burdens upon the Department. Under this provision it is contemplated that the Navy Department will prepare a list of such facilities and submit the same to Congress. If Congress should fail to disapprove of the proposed disposition during such 60-day period, the normal procedures for the disposition of property established by the Surplus Property Act would then be followed. It is not felt that this restriction and the delay incident thereto would unduly affect the operations of the Navy.

I understand that the committee is considering the modification of certain of the provisions of the bill to provide for several matters which have been called to the attention of the committee by other representatives of the Navy Department. If the requested modifications are made, I have no further comments to make.

Very truly yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

At this time, in response to the request of my valued friend the chairman of this committee, who notified me when he reported this bill, under permission also granted in the House, I include as a part of my remarks a letter which he wrote to me May 21, a letter which I wrote in response to his letter dated May 28, and his letter to me of May 30, in response to my letter. These letters are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1945.

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON,
Member of Congress,

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WILL: I am enclosing a copy of the bill and report relative to surplus property, which I respectfully request that you read.

I shall appreciate your giving me the benefit of your views in regard to the matter.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

CARL VINSON, Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1945.

H. R. 3180

HON. CARL VINSON,

Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D. C.

DEAR CARL: I refer to your letter of May 21 enclosing me a copy of the above bill and

report to confirm my verbal statement to you on the day following the receipt of your letter and to say again that I appreciate your courtesy and that in my judgment the legislation is not only premature but wholly unnecessary and would hamper the Surplus Property Act.

The Surplus Property Act of 1944 was approved by the Navy Department and combat naval vessels were excluded therefrom. Under the terms of the Surplus Property Act no property of any kind under the control and supervision of the Navy Department can be disposed of until it is declared surplus by the Navy Department. It is unthinkable that any property essential to the prosecution of the war or to defense in time of peace would be declared to be surplus by the Navy Department just as it is unthinkable that the Admiral of the Fleet would basely surrender that fleet in combat.

The Surplus Property Act has been in force since October 3, 1944, and thus far neither you nor anyone else has pointed out where the operation of that act has been administered so as to hamper in anywise the Navy Department. Under the act the Board is required to submit quarterly reports. As I understand, the Surplus Property Board did not testify, nor were they requested to testify or submit a report on the above bill. The Surplus Property Act may not be perfect, but in my judgment it would be exceedingly unwise to adopt the above or any other bills by piecemeal amendment. Congress passes legislation recommended by the Navy Department to prosecute the war. Congress cannot actually direct the engagements of the fleet. We trust the Navy Department. If we can trust the lives of our men to the Navy Department, we can certainly entrust the disposition of Navy property to the Department. The argument of congressional responsibility has no more force with respect to the Navy than it has with respect to the Army and with respect to other Government property.

If the power under the Surplus Property Act is abused by the Navy Department, I would be the first to advocate curbing the operations of the Department.

Very sincerely,

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., May 30, 1945.

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
Member of Congress,

House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WILL: I appreciate the frank expressions of your letter of May 28, 1945, but I regret that you dissent from the unanimous views of the Naval Affairs Committee on H. R. 3180.

While I fully respect your considered judgment on this bill, I cannot accept your interpretation that the legislation is premature and that it would hamper the Surplus Property Act.

You also raise questions as to (1) the committee's trust in the Navy Department, (2) the required quarterly reports of the Surplus Property Board to Congress, and (3) the fact that the opinion of the Surplus Property Board on H. R. 3180 was not sought by the committee. I shall give you my reaction to each of these points.

I believe that H. R. 3180 is timely legislation and not premature. If anything is premature it is the declaration of surpluses of naval property while we are in the midst of the greatest naval war in history. How can we know what is surplus until (1) Japan has been defeated, (2) we have sustained all our naval losses in defeating Japan, and (3) the size and complements of the postwar fleet have been determined.

No, I would say that the Surplus Property Act, insofar as it would permit unre-

viewed declarations and disposals of major naval property as surplus before Japan is defeated, is the legislation that is premature—not H. R. 3180.

Other than the delay caused by the 60-day waiting period, I fail to see how H. R. 3180 would hamper the Surplus Property Act. There are very tangible reasons for my conclusion:

First. The Secretary of the Navy has stated specifically on this point that he does not feel that the "delay incident thereto would unduly affect the operation of the Navy";

Second. The bill does not cover the voluminous "small fry" property, such as pencils, nuts and bolts, etc., which would ordinarily require quick sale;

Third. The bill covers only the major naval war facilities, such as vessels over a thousand tons, shore establishments, and plants, which you know and I know require some time for the negotiation of a sale—in fact, I cannot think of any sales in this category which would be unduly delayed by the 60-day waiting period; and

Fourth. A provision (sec. 4, p. 5, line 21) was incorporated in the bill to guard against such rare cases of injurious delay by providing that "property disposals, considered to require expeditious action by the Secretary of the Navy, may be made by the Department immediately after the Senate and House of Representatives have passed a concurrent resolution approving the property disposal or disposals proposed by the Secretary of the Navy."

As to the trust imposed in the Navy Department, there can be no question of the committee's position and faith. The possibility that the Navy Department might declare any property essential to the prosecution of the war or the defense in time of peace is granted to be unthinkable and most remote now. But need I remind you of how our Navy was scrapped after the last war?

It must also be realized that authoritative opinion, even in the Navy Department itself, differs as to what is essential to the Navy in peace and in war. I know this only too well from the difficult and unpopular fight that I had to expand the Navy in those preparatory, but isolationist, years. I can assure you that there were varying and violent opinions then as to what was essential. And there will be those differences after this war.

The provision of the Surplus Property Act requiring the Surplus Property Board to submit quarterly reports to Congress is hardly an adequate substitute for the reviewing authority of Congress proposed in H. R. 3180. In the former, Congress would learn only after the horse had gotten out of the stable—under H. R. 3180, Congress learns before and has a chance to lock the stable door before losing the horse.

There is no necessity to invite the views of the Surplus Property Board on H. R. 3180 simply because the Board is concerned with disposals and H. R. 3180 is concerned only with declarations of surplus, and under it Congress has nothing to do with disposals of surplus property.

The declarations of major naval property to be surplus are made by the Navy Department and not by the Surplus Property Board. H. R. 3180 in no way affects the disposal authority of the Surplus Property Board—it has only a limited effect on the Navy Department's declaration of surpluses.

Consequently there was no need to solicit the views of anyone but officials of the Navy Department on H. R. 3180. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who has cognizance over property disposition in the Navy Department, has expressed the opinion that the bill is sound.

I agree with you that the argument of congressional responsibility has no more force with respect to the Navy than it has with respect to the Army and with respect to other Government property. In fact, I

feel that other committees might well follow the lead of the Naval Affairs Committee in reporting out H. R. 3180.

I hope my statements will give you a better appreciation of H. R. 3180.

Yours very truly,

CARL VINSON, *Chairman*.

He stated to me in his letter, as he has stated here, that the passage of the Surplus Property Act was premature. Who is right? The late Franklin D. Roosevelt who provided for it by Executive order? The Congress of the United States, after considering it for 2 months, following the precedents after every other war?

I say in conclusion, as I have no desire to detain the Committee, that the Surplus Property Act is not perfect. I call attention to the fact, as I previously emphasized, that it does occur to me that the committee that undertakes to deal with surplus property should have invited that agency which has been appointed by the President and authorized by the Congress, at least to acquaint the Congress and the committee with their views on this bill.

In this bill there is nothing said about the Surplus Property Act. The administrators were not consulted, or asked to report on the pending bill. Under the consent granted me in the House, I want to include a letter to me from ex-Senator Guy Gillette, chairman, dated May 28, 1945, in which he points out conclusively that the term of this bill is the first step in the destruction of that act. The letter follows:

SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1945.

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In re H. R. 3180, introduced May 10, 1945, by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, I wish to make a few brief comments.

It would seem that the passage of this type of legislation would be particularly unwise as contravening the basic purposes which brought about the enactment of the Surplus Property Act of 1944. As your close connection with the surplus-property legislation has convinced you, the basic thought which emphasized the need for the legislation was that numerous agencies of the Government, through sundry laws already in existence, were disposing of Federal property of many types with very limited restriction or control. In addition, other Federal agencies were seeking to procure property which some of the owning agencies were selling. In order to coordinate this field of activity and bring some semblance of order out of the confusion, the President issued his Executive order in February 1944 setting up the Surplus Property Administration.

In passing the Surplus Property Act of 1944, which set up a board in lieu of an Administrator, the Congress sought to further the objectives of elimination of confusion and securing coordinated control, and at the same time to conserve the interest of segments of our economy through a system of priorities and preferences.

Legislation such as H. R. 3180 would, it would seem to me, be a definite step away from the goals sought. The argument that the legislation proposes to restore to Congress the constitutional responsibility of maintaining a navy has no particular force when it is recalled that our Federal Constitution also enjoins on the Congress the establishment of post offices and post roads, the obligation to raise and support armies,

the obligation to establish, organize, and arm militia, the supervision and control of property in the District of Columbia, in forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, and other needful public buildings, and many provisions of like import. All these impose on the Congress the responsibility of control of all public property in connection with these obligations and obviously it must by legislation make provision for the control and disposal of all these properties, and no argument has any specific force with reference to naval property other than combatant vessels that does not apply with equal force to the Army establishment and all of the other types of public property noted above. The Constitution took cognizance of this control and need for regulatory legislation for disposal in section 3, article IV, where it was provided that "power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting territory and other property" was lodged in the Congress. I repeat that any argument that Congress ought to keep property of our naval establishment under its direct supervision would apply with equal force to most of the other types of Federal property.

As you know, better than I, it was the thought of the Congress in setting up the Surplus Property Board that control of the disposal of Federal property declared to be surplus should be centered in one responsible agency, and any attempt to diffuse this responsibility piecemeal, as is envisioned in H. R. 3180, would certainly be in contravention of the purposes designed to be served.

In the Surplus Property Act the Congress took cognizance of the needs of the Navy when in defining the term "property," combatant naval vessels such as battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines were specifically eliminated. Also, the act specifically took control of our merchant marine out of the control of the Surplus Property Board in subsection (b) of section 10 of the act.

It was certainly the thought of Congress that outside of these certain exceptions, the Surplus Property Board was to be the responsible agency in the disposal and distribution of Federal property declared to be surplus by an owning agency.

The argument for naval control of its own establishments loses force when it is recalled that the Surplus Property Board does not have supervision over any type of Federal property until it has been declared surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the respective owning agency. The Navy is certainly competent to review its holdings and make such determination for declaration to the Board. The proposed legislation takes that right away from the Navy and not only prohibits the disposal of property by the Navy, but also prohibits its declaration of its own surplus until after specific report has been made to the Congress and a certain time elapses and a 60-day failure on the part of the Congress to act. The framers of the legislation, having in mind the serious handicap that this would impose on the Navy, sought by the proviso at the end of section 4 of the bill to avoid the difficulty by authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of articles if the Congress had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal. This emphasizes the confusion in thinking behind the bill. In the first place, the bill provides that no disposal can be made or determination as to surplus character until a report is made to Congress and Congress has taken a negative action by failing to act for 60 days, while the proviso above referred to authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of property on affirmative action by resolution of the Congress. There is no way of determining whether the framers of the bill had in mind that this second resolution should or should not apply to property that had been reported to the Congress.

Subsection (a) of section 4 requires the Secretary of the Navy in reporting to Congress relative to a naval war facility to set forth the reasons why the facility is no longer needed by the Department of the Navy, together with the contrary views, if any, of the Chief of Naval Operations. The framers of the proposal seem to be convinced that the report is to come to the Congress on a divided opinion in the Navy Department and envision a minority report. It is certainly reasonable to suppose that the Secretary of the Navy, under the present Surplus Property Act, would not determine and declare property to be surplus unless such action represented the considered opinion of the chiefs of his Department.

To further confuse the situation which would follow the enactment of this bill, the proviso at the conclusion of section 4 would place the disposal responsibility of property concerned on the Secretary of the Navy entirely independently of the Surplus Property Board and subject to none of the provisions of the Surplus Property Act as to priorities and preferences. Subsection (b) of section 5 of the bill provides that any plant (and this would consist of land and structures equipped with machinery, tools, and equipment) under the control of the Department of the Navy may be leased for periods not exceeding 5 years, provided that similar reports of intention were made to the Congress and the Congress had not prohibited such action by the passage of a concurrent resolution. This provision would clothe the Secretary of the Navy with the power with reference to the leasing of plants, which is definitely secured by the Surplus Property Act in the Surplus Property Board, and the power which does not adhere, in my opinion, in any comparable situation in any department of the Government, and certainly ought not be granted.

Subsection (c) of section 5 of the bill carries a statement which I find it impossible to interpret. It is either meaningless, or if it has a meaning, it is so obscure that it does not lend itself to interpretation. Or, if interpreted on its face provisions, it would render the whole bill an ineffective and useless thing.

Subsection (7) of subsection (a) of section 5 of the bill provides that the act shall not prevent "the scrapping or destruction of any vessel damaged beyond economical repair", but this does not refer to the right to dispose of such scrapped or salvaged property such as is envisioned in section 14 of the Surplus Property Act. Or, in other words, the bill would prohibit the disposal of property but would not prohibit its destruction.

As a final comment, if the Congress deems it in the public interest to require that certain property declared as surplus by the Navy as owning agency be not disposed of without first reporting it to Congress, it would be a simple matter to amend section 19 of the Surplus Property Act which requires the reporting of certain plant facilities to the Congress before they can be disposed of under the Act. If Congress deems this safeguard necessary, a simple amendment to this section would accomplish this end without destroying the framework and purpose of the Surplus Property Act.

With personal greetings, I am

Sincerely yours,

GUY M. GILLETTE, Chairman.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment. This bill under consideration—and I weigh my words—provides for the disposal of plants. The Government has invested billions of dollars in those plants. We have been urged to reconvert them in order to provide for employment following the war. The terms of this

bill change the methods and provisions of the Surplus Property Act, and the bill provides that notwithstanding the fact that any plant has heretofore been constructed, as a war plant, and no longer manufactures munitions, yet the bill gives the Navy Department veto power over the disposal of it. That is not all. I read from section 19 of the Surplus Property Act. My good friend, the chairman, read the terms of section 19 of this act, and when I called his attention to it he said that no report was required by the Board and the Congress had no jurisdiction over plants costing \$5,000,000 and over. He is again in error. Section 19 reads:

The Board, in cooperation with the various disposal agencies, shall prepare and submit to the Congress within 3 months after enactment of this act, a report as to each of the following classes of surplus property (not including any plant which cost the Government less than \$5,000,000).

These plants are for the Army and the Navy. We require the Surplus Property Administration to outline and set forth the amount, the cost, and the location of the property. I do not have a plant in my district, but if we are going to take all of the plants of the Navy Department out from under the operation of the act, I respectfully submit we should abolish the Surplus Property Act.

When I asked the distinguished chairman if this act did not provide that the Board had to report on these plants before they could be disposed of as required, my friend said they did not and that Congress would have an opportunity to act. I read:

Whenever the Board may deem it to be in the interest of the objectives of this act it may authorize the disposition of any surplus property listed in classes 9 to 12, inclusive.

I quote:

With respect to the property listed in sections 1 to 8—

I call them over: Aluminum plants, magnesium plants, synthetic rubber plants, and so on, vital war plants in which we have invested five, ten, twenty, in some cases a hundred million dollars—

With respect to the property listed in sections 1 to 8, inclusive, no disposition shall be made or authorized until 30 days after the report or additional report has been made while Congress is in session except that the Board may authorize any disposal agency to lease any such property for a term of not more than 5 years.

Under the terms of this bill, what does the Secretary report to Congress? Does he tell what that plant cost? Does he tell how much money the taxpayers have invested in it? He is only required to report in order to enable us to exercise our constitutional prerogatives, one thing, one thing alone, and that is as to whether or not it is surplus. From his report you have got one thing and one thing alone, his reasons for declaring it surplus. What information would you have? What information would Congress have as to value in order to pass a resolution or a bill either prohibiting or authorizing the disposal of that property?

The Secretary of the Navy asked us to appropriate the other day some \$22,000,-

000,000 on the statement that it was needed for the prosecution of this war against Japan. He now states that certain property is no longer needed, and it should be disposed of. When he so states and declares the Board provides for its disposition under the Surplus Act. To handle the matter now under the pending-bill basis nullifies the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. It further delays the reconversion that we authorized and provided 6 months ago, by saying that in addition to the 30 days, in addition to the 3 months for the report, we have got to wait now a further 60 days; and when we do, whatever be the intention of this committee, I respectfully submit that there is at least doubtful language here and that there is ample reason for saying that this bill provides that there will be a disposal by the Navy Department. The Board, under the Surplus Property Act, names the disposal agency.

Why do I say that? The clauses "disposal by the Navy Department" or "disposal by the War Department" are not mentioned in the Surplus Property Act. The disposal agencies are named by the Board. They are the agencies that are set up by the Surplus Property Administration. I read from page 7, subsection (b) of section 5:

Any plant under the control of the Navy may under regulations prescribed by the Navy Department—

The Surplus Property Act states that those regulations have got to be prescribed by the disposal agency. Absolutely contradictory. Read the language again on the top of page 5, line 23, of this bill:

By the Department of the Navy.

What is the purpose of this bill? My good friend, the gentleman from Oregon, has been perfectly open and above board. He would prevent the disposal of an airfield or a base, or a shipyard along the Pacific coast under the terms of his amendment as he proposed it without affirmative action.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thought I made it plain that I still believed in this affirmative action.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I said the gentleman had been perfectly frank. The gentleman still believes that. Talk to me about the constitutional prerogatives of Congress. It is up to us to wage war. How do we wage war? How do we send our sons to battle? We send them to battle to fight under the officers, the generals, and the admirals provided by the War Department and the Navy Department. Why have we voted \$300,000,000 for the prosecution of the war by the War Department and by the Navy Department? It was upon their recommendation.

If we can trust to the War Department and to the Navy Department the matter of the disposition of the lives of the people of our country, surely we can trust them in the matter of determining what is surplus property in their field—because no man has ever suggested any better way of determining surplus property than as provided in the Surplus

Property Act, and that provision is adopted by this bill. It provides that that surplus has got to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

The Committee on Naval Affairs has heretofore secured the passage of an act that provides that before any naval equipment valued at \$2,000 or more can be disposed of, the Naval Affairs Committee must be notified in 24 hours. The Naval Affairs Committee has secured the adoption of a statute that now requires the approval of any contract for the disposition or acquisition of any lands by the Navy Department by the Committee on Naval Affairs. No other committee of Congress receives the notice as to the acquisition or disposition of lands and as to the acquisition of naval equipment of over \$2,000 in value. The Naval Affairs Committee is the agent of Congress. The Navy Department, therefore, is required, before any property can be declared surplus or dispose of or acquired, to notify the Committee on Naval Affairs. Under the terms of the pending bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Naval Affairs Committee has had notice, it is now proposed to delay the matter further by requiring notice for 60 days if the property has been declared surplus by the Navy Department. The effect is to delay reconversion, to delay the disposal of property. It is impossible for Congress to go into the business of disposal of plants. Congress has to appoint an agent to handle the disposition of surplus property, and for the first time in the history of Congress an integrating Surplus Property Act was passed. If there are any defects respecting the disposal of Navy property, the remedy is to amend and not to nullify or destroy the provisions of that act.

Mark my language, in addition to reporting all plants, and I cannot make the language any plainer than the law, the Board cannot provide for the disposal of property valued at \$1,000,000 or more without an opinion of the Attorney General that the disposition is not in violation of the antitrust or monopoly laws of the United States. The Attorney General has 90 days to give this opinion.

The objection to this bill is that it will prevent and hamper and delay the Surplus Property Administration from providing for the disposing of property that the Navy Department has declared to be surplus. I read in this connection and I quote from the report of the Secretary of the Navy on the pending bill:

This report would have the effect under certain circumstances of slowing up the disposal of property which the Navy determined was surplus to its needs.

Will the bill clarify the Surplus Property Act? The Secretary of the Navy does not say that it will. The Surplus Property Administration was not consulted. We have not their views. I repeat, if this act is followed by a similar act for the War Department, fifty to one hundred billion dollars of surplus property may go by the board and the bill will make for confusion worse than confounded.

Under the program for reconversion an act was passed and the Surplus Property Act was passed. Under the Director of

Mobilization contracts were authorized to be settled. Shall we now further delay in order to prevent the Navy Department from declaring surplus an airfield in my district or your district. In order to prevent the Navy Department from declaring a ship-repair station on the Atlantic coast surplus, when now we may need more ship-repair stations on the Pacific coast and will have to provide for such stations on that coast? Shall we delay, in the language of the Secretary, the actual disposal of surplus property?

The bill also goes further. Congress will be called upon to make large appropriations for the conservation and care of that property during the delay. The Surplus Property Act may not be perfect, as I have repeatedly said.

Under the terms of that act no property that cannot be disposed of under this act can be disposed of. In my judgment, it would be most unwise and in opposition to the policy of reconversion of the Administration to pass this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us, sponsored by the very able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Naval Affairs. In my opinion, it is based on a sound principle of government.

We are faced with the very serious problem of working out in the future the relationship between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government. We all recognize that we do not want to tie the legislative branch of the Government bogged down with too much detail; on the other hand, it is important that the Congress should maintain a close control over and supervision of basic policies.

That is a policy this bill will forward. We will be maintaining a very large Naval Establishment in the postwar world—no one disputes that—particularly in the immediate postwar world, and the supervision of that Naval Establishment must properly become the province of the Congress.

If we have rapid disposal of large sections of the Navy or the Navy establishments without Congress supervising such actions carefully, we would be betraying our trust to the people. The measure before us is a very simple bill. It simply says that there shall be reported to the Congress any vessels or establishment for which the sale or lease is contemplated. I think that includes two things that are essential to our future welfare. It means that we will know what is happening to the Navy and we will be responsible, as we should be, for the maintenance of the Navy. But, secondly, it also means that we will be in a position to best utilize that portion of the large numbers of defense plants that have been built during the war which come under the supervision of the Navy, for the welfare of the people. It will make the Congress responsible for keeping an eye on that situation. I do not fear, as the gentleman from Mississippi does, that the passage of this bill

would slow up the reconversion period. I think, on the contrary, it might have a very healthy effect on shaping that reconversion program for the best interest of all the people of the country. That is a problem in which Members of this House have a very deep and vital interest. I think that this House is going to have to tackle and tackle very seriously the question of full employment before very many months go by. My deep interest in that problem is one of the reasons why I am enthusiastic about the passage of this bill.

I want to see a responsibility established by statute which will force the Congress to take a very close interest in the disposition of our surplus factories and similar establishments that come under Navy Department control. For the same reason I hope that similar legislation will be forthcoming for the War Department, the Maritime Commission, and other agencies of the Government which have a considerable interest in disposing of this type of surplus property, because if we do not take a good deal of caution and a good deal of care in the disposal of our factories we may find that large corporations, corporations which are tied in with cartels, may be interested in obtaining these properties either through sale or by lease for the purpose of taking them out of production. I want to have the opportunity which this bill gives us to be able to scrutinize such deals and in that manner make the Congress live up to its responsibility.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If that be the purpose of the gentleman, is it not better provided for by the Surplus Property Act, whenever a bid is submitted, that we have the opinion of the Attorney General about cartels and trusts?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I think the gentleman himself has pointed out that this bill does not cut out the normal surplus property procedure. The Secretary of the Navy has pointed out that fact as well. The bill is an added safeguard and a safeguard that I personally believe is very wisely added to existing procedures. I hope that this bill is going to pass by a resounding majority. I do not see any reason why we should be worried about the fears propounded by the gentleman from Mississippi. The virtues of the bill, to my mind, far outweigh any possible disadvantages that have been outlined to us here.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, after a careful study of H. R. 3180, a bill to impose certain restrictions on the disposal of naval vessels and facilities necessary to the maintenance of the combatant strength and efficiency of the Navy, I am very glad to announce my complete support of this bill. This bill was carefully studied by the Committee on Naval Affairs for a period of several days and, as a result of that study, and of the testimony of witnesses appearing

before the committee, the bill was unanimously approved.

I want to take this occasion, first, of paying my tribute of respect to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of our committee, who for many years last past has been an assiduous student of the Navy and a great booster and supporter of our entire Navy in all its fields.

The purpose of H. R. 3180 is to restore to the Congress authority over dispositions of important naval facilities, in keeping with congressional responsibility for the maintenance of the Navy. The provisions of this bill, which would guarantee that the Congress will have notice of and opportunity to consider all proposed declarations of surplus and disposal of the various naval plants and naval stations and the more important naval units, would restore the constitutional system of checks and balances between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, by providing the Congress an opportunity to exercise an effective veto in their disposition.

This legislation follows a long-established policy of Congress in the handling of Navy property.

The bill reaffirms and clarifies the policy of Congress as to disposal of our battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines and also provides that appropriate notice and a 60-day opportunity to act by concurrent resolution be given to Congress prior to the disposal of—

First. Any floating drydock, or any mine vessel, patrol vessel, auxiliary, landing ship, or district craft of a thousand tons or more;

Second. Any Navy yard, Navy airfield, naval training station, naval ordnance plant or depot, naval base or other installation; and

Third. Any Government-owned plant under Navy cognizance for producing articles, materials, or supplies for the Navy, excepting so-called "scrambled" plants and plants not capable of economic operation as a separate and independent unit, and plants which are not an integral part of a larger installation of a private contractor.

For more than a hundred years, the Congress has surrounded the disposition of Navy property with the most rigid restrictions through the enactment of specific legislation. With the exception of battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines before mentioned, this guarded control was relinquished by the Seventy-eighth Congress to the executive department in the enactment of broad legislation on the disposal of surplus property. In the consideration of that broad legislation, an amendment to prohibit any disposition of combatant naval vessels, stations, and establishments without the consent of Congress, was adopted by unanimous vote.

Today the United States has the largest, most potent, and most efficient Navy in the world, or in the past history of the world. Our United States Navy is larger than the combined navies of all other nations, and much stronger than any combination of foreign navies which

could be brought against us. It is a source of great gratification to the American people that our Navy occupies so powerful a place in the naval status of the world.

Let me call your attention, in review, to this brief summary of the Navy as of December 1944. Since July 1, 1940, the Congress has authorized the Navy to spend for defense and war \$118,000,000,000; with this vast sum of money, the Navy has accomplished the following things:

Since July 1, 1940, it has inducted, fed, clothed, housed, and trained 3,600,000 officers and men; has built, armed, supplied, fueled, and sent to sea 10,300,000 tons of ships; has built, armed, fueled, and launched 62,000 planes; and has also built and equipped 300 advance bases. With the Navy's personnel and its equipment, our Navy now constitutes the world's largest fleet.

Just to show you what the Navy has accomplished, let me state that our fleet in 4 years of war has convoyed over the Atlantic and Pacific troops and supplies aggregating 61,000 ships; landed on enemy beaches assault waves of 1,200,000 troops; sunk 1,400 enemy ships, totaling approximately 4,750,000 tons; shot down or destroyed 10,000 planes; and cleared the Japs from a Pacific area of 8,170,000 square miles.

I am particularly pleased with this record for the reason that as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee I have had the opportunity of watching the Navy grow and participated in that growth. When I went on the Naval Affairs Committee, officers and men in the Navy only numbered 152,000. Today the Navy personnel is more than 3,600,000, and the total number of ships of all kinds, large and small, exceeds 65,000. This has been a tremendous accomplishment.

Because of the tremendous size of the American Navy and the need for naval facilities of all kinds, particularly in time of war, it becomes especially important that the disposition of surplus naval facilities should be safeguarded with the most rigid care and thought. Not only in time of war today but subsequently when the world is at peace the disposition of our naval facilities is and will be a decision of such importance that it should ultimately rest in the Congress, where it has rested heretofore since the beginning of our Government, with brief exceptions.

H. R. 3180 would leave the initial decisions in the determination and disposal of surplus property to the executive department. It attempts to avoid any impractical delays resulting from the 60-day waiting period, by providing for authorization of disposals considered to require expeditious action by the Secretary of the Navy, through affirmative concurrent resolution of both Houses.

With the termination of the present World War, it will naturally follow that many of our naval vessels and facilities will be disposed of, in order that our Navy may at all times be provided with newer and more effective implements of war.

It was my privilege in December of last year, through the courtesy of my committee and of the Navy Department, to become one of a subcommittee of the

Naval Affairs Committee appointed for the purpose of studying the naval facilities in the Pacific area.

The committee, nine in number, inspected naval facilities, including ship yards, storehouses, air fields, and other facilities, at Pearl Harbor, Kwajalein, Saipan, Guam, Manus, Sydney, Canberra, Samoa, and Palmyra. The committee flew some 25,000 miles over the Pacific, and through the courtesy of Admiral Nimitz, his staff, and the various officers of the different bases, was enabled to make a close study of our naval facilities and naval activities. We were greatly impressed with the efficiency and effectiveness of the Navy in all its departments and we had nothing but words of praise for officers and men comprising our great American Navy.

Distances in the Pacific are so vast and the value of our bases, particularly at Pearl Harbor, Kwajalein, Saipan, and Guam, is so strategic, that it is imperative in the future, in my judgment, that the United States should own, or control, those great naval bases which have been captured by the sacrifice of thousands of fine American boys and millions of dollars.

Fondly, as we hope for a just and lasting peace, it is imperative to this Nation, and to the Navy, that these islands be held by us as strategic bases in the event of a future potential war. Not only that, but these islands will become of greater importance in the years to come, as America takes her number one place in the air traffic of the world.

In the years to come, it will be necessary to maintain the largest peacetime Navy that this country has ever maintained. To do so is simply carrying out the principle of not only safeguarding the integrity of our Nation, but a further guaranty of a just and lasting peace. The best way to be prepared for peace is to maintain a fine effective Army and Navy, sufficiently strong to guarantee the peace and safety and integrity of our Nation.

For the reasons before mentioned, I favor the passage of H. R. 3180.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Izac].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the debate I gathered a few notes which I thought might be pertinent. There is no need of repeating the arguments that have been advanced, but in these few minutes I will try to answer a few of the points that have been raised and alleviate some of the doubt in the minds of some of the listeners.

In the first place, this bill has nothing to do with boots and shoes and food supplies and things of that character. We feel it is perfectly right and proper that the Surplus Property Board shall dictate the manner in which those surpluses are disposed of. But we are interested in the disposal of the men-of-war, navy bases and the like, because that determines the postwar policy of this country. If we are going to disarm and do as we did once before or probably several times before, we are going to have another Pearl Harbor some day, but if we are pretty well prepared, I question

if anyone is going to tackle the best-prepared Nation in the world.

In 1922 when we had the naval limitation agreement, you notice the Congress did not have very much to do with that. I am inclined to think that one of the valid reasons for a bill of this kind is the prevention of that which happened in 1922.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want at this time to pay my compliments to the chairman of the legislative Committee on Naval Affairs and the members of that committee in presenting a bill like this to the House. It will preserve the integrity of this country for the future.

Mr. IZAC. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and his compliments in favor of the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who has been in the forefront of a big Navy program certainly during the last 20 years.

This naval limitation agreement, as you know, was an agreement among nations. We sacrificed not just blueprints and a little structural steel, but we actually had ships in being, the finest ships that then sailed the seas. We had the finest aircraft carriers, battle cruisers, and battleships that we deliberately sunk. That was one method of disposal. Of course, we thought we were doing it in the interest of peace. I think the Congress of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the Naval Affairs Committee of this Congress should have something to say in case the Navy Department or any executive branch of the Government should come forward with another proposal such as that. I contend that Pearl Harbor would never have occurred had we gone ahead building, or even if we had preserved, the ships that were then in being. We would have been too powerful. While Japan has been looking for an opportunity to attack us for generations in order to become supreme in the Pacific, she would not have taken that opportunity at the time she did had we been well prepared.

Here is another thing: They speak about the delay in the disposal of these plants. I suppose you are going to try to reconvert rapidly; try to set up firms in these shipbuilding plants and these munitions plants immediately. It might cause a delay of 60 days. But should we not go a little slow when it comes to turning over a \$50,000,000 plant and declaring it surplus, putting it in the hands of one of our great international institutions perhaps? You know we do have American firms which in the past have been members of cartels. They all like to have you forget it now, but just the same they did it before and they are likely to do it again. It is just as well Congress looked into this for 4 or 5 months. It will be under the regular surplus disposal act 3 months and then we give another 60 days here, at which time if we find no objection and if we do not pass a concurrent resolution, it will be in order for the Navy Department to dispose of that plant or rather to declare it surplus. I think that delay

might be a safeguard in case some generous individual wanted to give away half of the assets of the Navy.

Now, I come to the greatest deficiency in the original act, according to my idea. I refer to the Surplus Disposal Act. They accepted an amendment which eliminated combatant vessels, so called. They named five categories: Battleships, aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. They said that is all right. The Navy is taken care of. They have those five categories and the Surplus Property Board cannot touch them. Nobody can dispose of those. We eliminate them from the class of surplus property. But they forgot some of the most important of our combat types. Mr. Chairman, what would we have done without the destroyer escorts in this war? And they are not even mentioned in that amendment.

The destroyer escorts beat the submarine campaign of the Germans. The destroyer escorts relieved the destroyers of at least three-quarters of their normal duties. The destroyer escorts were built by the hundreds, yet without this bill we are considering today they could be disposed of by the Surplus Property Board without the Congress having any control over them. They happen to weigh over a thousand tons.

So you see in the original act, which is not perfect in a number of ways, we do have lack of foresight in not including destroyer escorts, fleet tugs, trawlers, mine sweepers, and other vessels of that type; and that is why I think it is very necessary that we have a bill of this kind; in fact, if it were up to me I would not place that limitation as high as 1,000 tons. I believe 250 or 300 tons is a proper limitation. But the Naval Affairs Committee was unanimous in agreeing that at least a thousand-ton ship was the proper size, that we should not relinquish the control of Congress over that type of vessel, nor over any vessel of at least 1,000 tons.

In conclusion let me say that I cannot see if we pass this bill that we are weakening the Surplus Property Act. This has nothing to do with the disposal of any other property at all. It does, as I say, take care of the seagoing fleet; and I believe Congress should retain control of that, because the postwar policy is going to be dictated not alone by the technical needs of the Navy but by the wish and will of the American people represented by us here who know the chance that always exists for new wars.

The most important thing before us today, as I see it—and this goes not only for the Committee on Naval Affairs but for the House of Representatives—is to see that we retain enough men-of-war, enough auxiliaries, and enough bases from which they can operate to preclude another war in our lifetime. It is the only way, in my opinion, that it can be done—being too powerful for the other fellow to tackle us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the honorable gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON. His judgment commands the highest respect of the Members of the Congress, especially his keen insight into naval affairs. He is regarded as the father of our fleet for it was his vision back in the preparatory, but isolationist, years that has made possible the greatest Navy in the history of the world—our Navy which is bigger than the combined navies of all the other nations of the world. Yes, he fought for the expansion of our Navy when it was not a popular thing to do—and his fight was most difficult. I hate to think of what the position of this country in World War II would have been if the gentleman from Georgia had not had the vision and the courage. The people of this country have realized, and are realizing, the victory dividends from his fight for a bigger Navy. We owe him a debt that can never be paid.

Little did I realize in 1938, when publicly stating on Navy Day that our Navy was inadequate and when advocating a two-ocean Navy, that I would have the privilege to be a Member of the House Naval Affairs Committee that fostered the creation of a seven-ocean Navy, the greatest in the history of the world.

And now the gentleman from Georgia has shown the way again—this time in the leadership for the preservation and maintenance of the great Navy which he fathered, through the introduction of H. R. 3180. This is so clearly recognized that the members of the Naval Affairs Committee are vigorously unanimous in their backing of this bill.

But I think that the leadership of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee goes beyond the consideration of the constitutional responsibility of Congress to provide and maintain a Navy. It strikes at the very roots of our three-branched system of government through the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. H. R. 3180, I believe, will lead the way for Congress to restore to itself much of its normal and constitutional authority and responsibility loaned to the executive branch for the war emergency.

It was necessary to make these loans of power to the executive branch. The Congress can be proud of the wise and unselfish manner in which it did make these loans of power through broad delegation of authority. The risk of the loans has been negligible in view of the victory interest paid on the loans. Certainly our trust in the Navy Department has been more than justified in view of the magnificent accomplishments of that Department in the use of the authority delegated to it. For this reason, H. R. 3180 is not to be interpreted in the slightest degree as evidencing anything but the greatest respect of, and trust in, the Navy Department.

But Congress must be ready to take back that authority and responsibility delegated for the duration to the executive branch. And H. R. 3180 is an example of how this reassertion can best

be done with the proper balance of participation of the legislative and executive branches in the peacetime period. This bill takes no authority from the Navy Department on the declaration of surpluses. This bill takes no authority from the Surplus Property Board on the disposal of surpluses declared by the Navy. It merely grants to Congress a 60-day opportunity to review the declarations of surplus made by the Navy Department on major naval war facilities.

The only objection to H. R. 3180 that can be advanced is the possibility that it might slow down the surplus-property disposal program through the requirement of the 60-day waiting period. This objection is not valid because—

First. The Secretary of the Navy has stated specifically on this point that he does not feel that the "delay incident thereto would unduly affect the operation of the Navy";

Second. The bill does not cover the voluminous "small fry" property—thousands of items referred to this afternoon, such as pencils, spoons, nuts and bolts, and so forth—which might require quick sales; and

Third. The bill gives Congress the chance to keep its finger on the major naval war facilities, such as vessels over a thousand tons, shore establishments and plants, which require considerable time for the negotiation of a sale—in fact, I cannot think of any sales in this category which would be unduly delayed by the 60-day waiting period.

In this connection I was impressed with the testimony of Admiral R. S. Edwards, deputy commander in chief of the Navy. He told the committee that there were potential instances where the 60-day waiting requirement might handicap disposals that required expeditious action. This prompted me to submit the following section, which was unanimously adopted by the committee, to guard against such rare cases of injurious delays caused by the 60-day requirement by providing for affirmative action by Congress upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy. I refer you to section 4, page 5, line 21 and following, of the printed bill, which reads:

Provided, That property disposals, considered to require expeditious action by the Secretary of the Navy, may be made by the Department of the Navy immediately after the Senate and House of Representatives have passed a concurrent resolution approving the property disposal or disposals proposed by the Secretary of the Navy.

This added a third manner in which the Congress could act in addition to the other two ways of either, first, passing a concurrent resolution stating that the property should be retained, or, second, acquiescing silently by taking no action within the 60-day period. It added flexibility desired by the Navy, but in no manner diluted the proposed congressional power of review. It removed any reason for undue delay on disposals on which time might be of the essence. It recognized the continued faith of the committee in the Secretary of the Navy.

I agree with the gentleman from Georgia when he says that it is premature to consider the disposal of any major naval

war facility now before we have defeated Japan—before we have suffered all of the naval losses that victory will require—and before we have even decided upon the size and complements of our postwar Navy. I agree with the greatest of conviction because I saw the extent and magnitude of our naval losses in the fight against Japan when I made an inspection tour of our naval bases in the Pacific last December. And I know that these losses will grow as we near the mainland of Japan.

The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee gave you the very core of this matter when he asked how could the Navy Department determine what major naval war facilities were surplus until it was known what we needed—and how could we know what we needed until the final score of losses had been chalked up. To use his own words, "don't take your shoes off before you get to the stream." How can we determine what major naval war facilities are surplus while we are in the midst of the greatest naval war in history?

Certainly the determination of the size and the complements of the postwar Navy is a matter of policy to be decided by the Congress with the advice and recommendations of the Navy Department. It is not a decision exclusively for the Navy Department. And the declaration of surpluses of major naval facilities is an integral part, and to that extent a predetermination of the postwar Navy in which Congress must have the prevailing voice.

This view raises no question as to the trust imposed in the Navy Department, for there can be no question of the committee's faith. As I have pointed out previously, the committee commends the Navy Department for the splendid manner in which it used the broad authority loaned for war by Congress—for the magnificent results that it obtained with that authority. The possibility that the Navy Department might declare any property essential to the prosecution of the war or the defense in time of peace is unthinkable and most remote.

But need I remind you of how our Navy was scrapped after the last war? The esteemed gentleman from Oregon, the Honorable JAMES W. MOTT, took the initiative in the last Congress to prevent the recurrence of any such scrapping of the Navy after the present war by offering an amendment to the surplus property bill requiring affirmative acts of Congress prior to the disposal of any major naval property. After full debate the Mott amendment was adopted unanimously by the House. For some reason which was never satisfactorily explained to the House the Mott amendment was stricken by the conferees from the surplus property bill.

It must be realized that authoritative opinion, even in the Navy Department itself, differs as to what is essential to the Navy in peace and in war. The gentleman from Georgia can better tell you of the varying and violent opinions of essentiality in the years preceding this war when he was fighting for the necessary expansion of the Navy. We must realize that there will be those differ-

ences after this war—and we must recognize that those differences can be resolved by Congress and by Congress alone.

Yes, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee has shown us the logical and considerate way to call in our war duration loans of delegated power to the executive branch. I expect this bill will be approved and I hope that other committees will follow the lead that he has taken in the introduction of H. R. 3180, and restore to Congress its normal and constitutional function of preserving and maintaining our Army and our merchant marine, as well as our Navy.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, sections 3 and 4 of this bill are to the effect that except as provided in section 5 no naval war facility described in section 1 (a) (1), (2), (3), and (4) shall be sold, leased, and so forth, to any political entity or governmental instrumentality, foreign or domestic, and so forth. Then section 5, in subparagraph (a) (3), states that no provision of this act shall prevent the lease, under any other law, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, of any naval war facility, for any period not extending beyond the date proclaimed by the President as the date of the termination of the present war, or beyond the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of its termination, whichever first occurs.

Mr. Chairman, while there is no doubt much merit in this bill, and I am, as everyone here should know by now, a very strong advocate of congressional control over its powers under the Constitution, I wonder if this bill is not a bit premature. In voicing that thought I want to do a little thinking out loud. Perhaps I am wrong, but certainly I should like to stimulate thought in the minds of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of this House along certain lines.

We had a conference at Mexico City a while back, the result of which was an action entitled "The Act of Chapultepec." As I understand, in the Conference now being held in San Francisco it is intended to provide for a regional security agreement. I think every member of the Committee on Naval Affairs knows, and if they do not they should know, that various countries in Latin America have in years gone by been supplied with certain naval and military equipment by European nations. It has been necessary, of course, for those countries using that equipment, whether it might be destroyers, cruisers, or what not, to purchase their ammunition from these European countries and likewise have the technical forces of the navy or the army of that foreign country become their advisers in the use of that material of war and in the training of their military and naval forces. As a result, the military and naval forces of those countries were subjected to indoctrination and, in some cases, almost subjugation to the military of those foreign countries. Argentina

has displayed evidences of that indoctrination.

I believe that in all probability as a result of these conferences being held, and of the Act of Chapultepec, already subscribed to, we would be taking premature action in making the pronouncements I have read in section 3, because it is quite possible that we might want to consider transferring, lending, leasing, exchanging, or what not, some of our surplus equipment for some of the old equipment that is now in the hands of our Latin-American friends.

It seems to me it would be very foolish to obstruct that possible good purpose by this bill because it would only be necessary, if this bill is passed, for the Navy Department to come to the Committee on Naval Affairs and to the Congress and ask them to repeal or modify certain sections of this act in case such a decision is made. I personally am of the temporary opinion at least, that we should give such a transfer or such lending or exchange of materials of war with the friends we have in Latin America the most careful consideration possible. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs whether the potentialities of such use by a regional protective force of the Western Hemisphere has been considered by his committee? Has the gentleman and his committee given consideration to the wisdom of the possible use of some of our surplus military or naval equipment by the members of a Western Hemisphere regional security group?

Mr. VINSON. I will say that matter has not reached the stage of a hearing but the subject matter has been gone into and considerable inquiry has been made as to the policy with reference to transferring certain facilities to certain hemispheric nations.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would not the gentleman say that this bill, H. R. 3180, as drafted, would put a considerable damper on such a potentiality?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all. It would not conflict at all.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman have any particular objection to excepting from the term "foreign countries" in section 3 members of the Pan American Union?

Mr. VINSON. I think that is a matter we should not embark upon without full hearings.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly why I think this bill is premature.

Mr. VINSON. That is the gentleman's opinion, to which he is entitled. I do not think it is premature, nor did the committee think the bill is premature. May I say it is classified merely as a stopgap, as was ably pointed out by the distinguished Member the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] before the postwar Navy is fixed. We cannot reach a decision until we know what the postwar Navy should be.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct. That is why I wonder just what the occasion for this bill is at the present time. Are the gentleman and his committee under some apprehension concerning the disposal of certain equipment of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all. We are not apprehensive about any particular equipment. But the gentleman and his committee are of the opinion that the Navy is of such importance to the Government, and therefore to the country, that Congress should still retain control of it.

Mr. HINSHAW. But the gentleman brings the bill to the floor of the House and has made a very ardent and persuasive speech in favor of it and has replied to the Members very courteously and very extensively. Yet I find no particular reason presented, except a constitutional one, argued as a basis for the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman know of any higher reason that could be offered?

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, the gentleman knows that the Constitution provides the Congress shall dispose of the property of the United States. There is not any act which the Navy can perform to do that without congressional authority.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; but the gentleman is in error there because the Surplus Property Act permits disposition of everything in the Navy, except five categories of major combatant vessels, without the action of Congress. I am trying to return to the constitutional function where the Congress either directly or indirectly will have a voice in the disposal of the property.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then why is it that the property included in section 1 (a) 1 is not submitted to the provisions of section 4, relating to congressional approval?

Mr. VINSON. For instance, if the Navy Department did not want to go through this channel which is mapped out in this bill, by sending it to the Congress, it might be able to circumvent a review by Congress by transferring certain property to another Government agency and then that Government agency could dispose of the property.

Mr. HINSHAW. The reason I asked the question of the gentleman was this: Vessels and facilities described in section 1 (1) 1 are those which he has already exempted, as I understand, but he has not placed in section 3 the same provisions that are contained in section 4, providing for the authority of the House to be exercised. In other words, he has completely foreclosed the possibility of making such an offer as I have discussed, to a member of the Pan American Union, and even if Congress does not within 60 days object, the property could not be transferred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

May I say that for some time the thought is being considered as to what the Government should do with reference to lease or to loan or to transfer certain facilities of the Navy to certain countries of this hemisphere. That matter is being explored and is being given careful consideration. There is a great deal of sympathy, under certain conditions, and under certain restrictions that certain specific property, even

in the postwar period, be allocated or sold or leased under certain terms and conditions, because they have the same hemispheric viewpoint.

Mr. HINSHAW. And interest.

Mr. VINSON. And interest that we have. That matter is being carefully considered.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to say to the gentleman that I would much rather see surplus naval equipment of the United States, whatever it may be, actively used by our pan-American neighbors in the defense of this hemisphere than I would to have them tied up at some Hog Island somewhere rusting.

Mr. VINSON. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. I may say that not long ago I appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. HEBERT, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. HESS, and they made a trip into Central and South America and they explored this subject matter. As a matter of fact, they have made some recommendations, but it has not yet crystallized into final form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes for the purpose of helping answer the question.

The chairman stated he was not immediately apprehensive about the transfer of these ships to other nations. I do not know whether he has any reason to be apprehensive or not. My own feeling is one of apprehension in that respect. I think there is a rather definite sentiment accumulating in the executive agencies of the Government to transfer some of these ships to other nations.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman himself be willing that they be used by members of a regional hemispheric defense organization?

Mr. MOTT. I would be willing to have that question come before the Congress; first to the Naval Affairs Committee and then to the House and the Senate, and for the Congress to decide whether that is the proper policy or not. I am not willing for an executive agency to decide it all by itself. That is one of my strongest reasons for supporting this bill.

Again may I say there is already sentiment developing that the war vessels—and they are about one out of every four or five that we have built; those vessels which we have given under lend-lease to other nations—a sentiment is developing in some quarters to actually let them have the vessels.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not favor that if it is outside of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MOTT. Just a moment. I have already made an observation on the Western Hemisphere, but I am going further. Every nation which has obtained those lend-lease war vessels would of course like to keep them. When the time of the lease expires, in my opinion, there is going to be an effort brought to bear and they are going to try to persuade the Government of the United States to let them keep those vessels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Under the Surplus Property Act those vessels could be declared surplus without the consent of Congress and title transferred, because the act has been construed to repeal all restrictive legislation on the disposal of naval property. I am apprehensive of that. This bill would provide that things of that kind cannot be done without the approval of Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to ask the gentleman if he has given any consideration to the provisions of section 2, and particularly subsection 2 of section 2 with respect to increasing the power and the authority over the Navy for the disposal of plants of the Defense Plants Corporation after those plants have ceased to manufacture munitions and other requirements for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; I have not considered that aspect of it; I am considering the question of hemispheric defense.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have not gone into the other subject as deeply as has the gentleman from Mississippi. I listened with interest to the remarks he made earlier this afternoon.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will probably have something more to say about it later.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield if I have any time remaining.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman does not remember that last year we passed a bill permitting the leasing or selling of ships up to 1,000 tons to the Pan-American Nations, having in mind the very thing the gentleman has in mind. The Senate however, did not take action on that bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. This bill, of course, exempts vessels under a thousand tons.

Mr. IZAC. That is right; so it could still be done.

Mr. HINSHAW. It could still be done.

Mr. IZAC. But as I see it, a ship of a thousand tons or under would not be needed by any South American country to repel an attack, because it would not be big enough to repel an attack.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have been to South America myself a few years ago and traveled around a bit, and I have seen some of the vessels supplied to those countries by European nations ostensibly for their defense, but actually to permit the officers of the navy of that European country to train and indoctrinate and act as the godfathers of their fleet; and I am opposed to that sort of thing. If we can get around that hazard to our safety by supplying them with certain vessels ourselves and letting such a fine man as Admiral Beaugregard proved himself to be in Brazil, go down there and train them in our way of handling a navy, I would feel differently.

Mr. IZAC. They send naval officers and men down there to train them; we are doing that at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the Congress will protect the American people against any hazard of unreasonable curtailment and reduction of its present great Navy. The American public today is almost unanimous in the desire not only to have the greatest Navy in the world but to preserve its present position of outranking all the combined navies of the world. If on December 7, 1941, America had 50 percent of its present navy strength, Japan would not have attacked us at Pearl Harbor. A strong Navy is our greatest insurance against future wars.

This bill, H. R. 3180, merely imposes certain restrictions on the disposition of naval vessels and facilities necessary to the maintenance of the combatant strength and efficiency of the Navy. Through the passage of this bill, Congress will retain and preserve its right to supervise the number of our fighting units which the Navy Department will be authorized to dispose of. The Naval Affairs Committee, by reporting out this bill, has agreed that too broad a responsibility has been delegated to the executive department of our Navy over the disposition of important naval facilities. This legislation insures the continuation of congressional responsibility for the maintenance of the Navy.

Under this bill the Navy Department cannot dispose of or transfer the bases, plants, and so forth, without first reporting to Congress. Congress may then approve or disapprove by a concurrent resolution, or give its consent by taking no action at all, in which case the Navy may act after the passing of a 60-day period. As for battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, or submarines, the bill would prohibit any kind of disposition except scrapping or destruction for overage damage, and so forth, and leasing under lend-lease, in which latter case the lease would not extend beyond the termination of the present war or specified date for termination decided by Congress. The bill reasserts and clarifies the policy of Congress, as to the disposal of our Navy fighting units.

Today the United States Navy is larger than the combined navies of all other nations, and this preeminence is the pride of America and guarantees the protection of America. Any curtailment of this great naval force or change in strength or policy should ultimately rest in the Congress.

The country can indeed be thankful for the magnificent fight made by our honorable chairman, CARL VINSON, and the members of the Naval Affairs Committee, for legislation to build a larger Navy back in the years before Pearl Harbor. The fighting ships that were built through the foresight of the House Naval Affairs Committee by the legislation passed in 1937 and 1938 has borne the brunt of the Pacific war. The Congress has displayed excellent judgment in the past by following the recommendations of its Naval Affairs Committee, and I

hope this legislation is adopted by unanimous vote.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read under the 5-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act the term—

(a) "Naval war facility" means any property of the United States or of any instrumentality of the United States, within any of the following categories, under the control of the Department of the Navy:

* (1) Any vessel classified in, or classifiable in accordance with, the classification set forth in "Standard Nomenclature and List of United States Naval Vessels", published December 1, 1944, by the Department of the Navy (Bureau of Ships), as a vessel of any of the following types: A battleship, cruiser, aircraft carrier, destroyer, or submarine.

(2) Any floating drydock, or any vessel (other than vessels of not more than 1,000 tons) classified in, or classifiable in accordance with, the classification set forth in "Standard Nomenclature and List of United States Naval Vessels", published December 1, 1944, by the Department of the Navy (Bureau of Ships), as a vessel of any of the following types: A mine vessel, patrol vessel, auxiliary, landing ship, or district craft. For the purposes of this subsection the term "1,000 tons" means 1,000 tons standard displacement, unless the Secretary of the Navy determines that measurement in terms of gross tons in the manner provided in section 4153 of the Revised Statutes is more appropriate, in which case such term means gross tons measured in the manner provided in such section 4153.

(3) Any navy yard, navy airfield, naval training station, naval ordnance plant or depot, naval base, or any other property, consisting of land having buildings or other structures thereon or having buildings or other structures used in connection therewith, which constitutes the whole or any part of a naval station, excluding, in the case of any of the foregoing, property acquired or constructed by the Navy for use solely in connection with programs for the training of naval personnel at colleges and universities (other than the United States Naval Academy).

(4) Any plant acquired, constructed, or used to manufacture or produce articles, materials, or supplies for the Navy.

(b) "Plant" includes only a plant (consisting of land, including land under option to the United States, and structures substantially equipped with machinery, tools, and equipment) which is capable of economic operation as a separate and independent unit, and which is not an integral part of a larger installation of a private contractor.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are doing a very dangerous thing when we start tearing down the Surplus Property Act that was passed last fall. At the present time in the Committee on Executive Expenditures there are pending 15 or 20 bills to amend this act. We have been awaiting studies that are being made now by the Surplus Property Board and other governmental agencies to give them an opportunity to find out the unworkable provisions of that act. Frankly, there are many things in the act that should be removed. I opposed in the conference committee many of the provisions that were put in there, but due to the pressure of time and the anxiety of Members to get back home and do some campaigning, the conferees on the part of the House agreed to many items in that

conference report which we thought were unworkable.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost confidence in the men who are running our Navy. They have certainly conducted this war in a very successful manner. I have the utmost confidence in the Secretary of the Navy. I have the utmost confidence in the future leadership of that organization, but in voting for a bill like the present one it seems to me we are casting a shadow of doubt on the integrity of those charged with the defense of our country. I can foresee some of the dangers in having restrictive legislation of this sort prohibiting a declaration of obsolete equipment, such as LST's, plants, and so forth, surplus.

You are going to find if this bill is passed that there will be a bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs to place the War Department property in the same category. Then if I were a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency I would offer a bill to cover all of the property owned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries. So that it will ultimately result in the nonoperation of plant after plant in many of your districts.

During the last war a plant was built in my district and for years, years, and years, opponents of Mr. Will Bankhead would promise the people in this particular district that if they would elect them to Congress the plant would be operated. This plant was near Muscle Shoals. As a result of its nonoperation thousands and thousands of dollars worth of equipment became obsolete and it was finally sold, I believe, in 1943.

When you men go back home you will find there will be a lot of aircraft factories in your district, shipyards and other plants. We all know it will be impossible to get appropriation bills through the Congress to continue the operation of the Marietta bomber plant, for instance, the Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft factory and the huge shipping yards that exist in the districts of many of the Members. But if you have a bill like this on the statute books your constituents are going to come to you and say, "All right, we want this plant to continue to operate," and you cannot convince them that you cannot come before Congress and get enough money to continue the operation of that plant. There are 435 Members of Congress, and I am sure we are not going to continue to appropriate money during peacetimes at the rate we are now appropriating money to conduct this war.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to detain the committee unduly and I rise at this time for the purpose of saying that the destruction of battleships comparable to what happened under the Washington Armament Treaty is not involved in this bill, and to say further, as I recall, with all due deference to the Congress, that those battleships were not destroyed without congressional approval because under the Constitution the treaty had to be ratified at least by the Senate before they could be destroyed.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman admits, however that the Representatives never had any control over that at all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly, sir; and for that reason I was just about to say that that question is not involved in this bill because under the section now under consideration no provision can be made for the disposal of any combat ship in identical language both in this bill and the Surplus Property Act so that the argument, in my judgment, has no place in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. IZAC. The trouble is that that only includes five categories of combatant ships, and I tried to point out that there are many other types of combatant ships, and furthermore, the bases are the most important of all because you cannot fight a naval war without bases.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I say in response to that contention that the action of the committee in the pending bill in making two categories and in describing battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines in one, and placing drydocks and other vessels in another category, provides and authorizes the disposition of drydocks and all vessels except the combat vessels named. Under the terms of the pending bill, the drydocks and every one of the vessels except the combat vessels can be disposed of without any affirmative action by the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. Except to be notified.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, yes; that is all. We are being notified every day. We are notified by the Surplus Property Board, making its reports and having their regulations published in the Federal Register that comes to our desk every day. Something has been said about this bill being essential to maintain a great Navy and our combat vessels, and thereby criticizing the Surplus Property Act. I reply to that statement, and I measure my words by saying that the provisions of the Surplus Property Act and the provisions of this bill with respect to the combat vessels are in identically the same language because they are spelled out. And I measure my words when I make this further statement that under the terms of this bill one of these battleships, one of these cruisers, one of these carriers may be destroyed whenever the Navy, without any action on the part of the Congress, declares that it is of no value whatsoever. When you talk about this bill being essential to preserve the Navy, I call your attention to the fact that under the Surplus Property Act, in response to the repeated objection of Members of Congress, to the destruction of property by the Army and the Navy, that there is included in that act a provision that the lumber that has been burned up and the other material that has been burned up by the Navy and the Army cannot be destroyed until and unless public notice is given.

I would like to say in this connection, once and for all that under the terms of

the Surplus Property Act the Board does not dispose of surplus property. It does not sell it or lease it. It prescribes the regulations. It advises Congress of the regulations. It names the disposal agencies. The purpose is to provide that all property of the same kind be disposed of by the same agency. Under the terms of the act a few agencies are designated for disposal of property, but generally under the act, the Board designates the disposal agencies, while under the Surplus Property Act no disposition, scrapping, or otherwise, can be made of combat vessels, yet, under the terms of this bill—I quote from page 7—subsection 7 of section 5:

No provision of this act shall prevent the scrapping or destruction of any vessel damaged beyond economical repair.

The destruction or the scrapping of all of these combat vessels is provided for in the pending bill but not the Surplus Property Act.

The difference between the constructive provisions of the Surplus Property Act and this bill, in order to protect the Navy and its combat vessels and prevent a repetition of 1922, is that if one of these vessels is scrapped, if one of these vessels is to be destroyed, the scrap material would be sold and the proceeds paid into the Public Treasury rather than destroyed and then scrapped only after an act of Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. No provision of existing law shall be deemed to authorize—

(1) the sale, lease, donation, or other disposition, of any naval war facility to any person, or to any political entity or governmental instrumentality, foreign or domestic; or

(2) the consent to a sale, lease, donation, or other disposition of any plant with respect to which consent of the Department of the Navy is required before a sale, lease, donation, or other disposition thereof can be made; or

(3) a determination that any naval war facility is surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the Department of the Navy, or the transfer of any naval war facility from the jurisdiction or control of the Department of the Navy; except subject to the restrictions prescribed in this act.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I ask the chairman of the committee, is it the intent of the committee that section 2, subsection (2), particularly, of this bill, shall give the Navy Department supervision and control of defense plants after those defense plants, constructed by the Defense Plant Corporation, have ceased to provide munitions and other manufactures required by the Navy Department?

Mr. VINSON. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi, to answer his question intelligently I invite the attention of the Committee to the fact that the word "plant" is designated on page 3, lines 10 to 15. That defines exactly what kind of plants this bill deals with. Any plant that does not fall within that definition is not included in this paragraph or in this bill.

We have requested the Navy to interpret the word "plant" by the yardstick we have set out, and as a result

of that interpretation we have purposely and openly and aboveboard listed in the report the plants in the jurisdiction of the Navy Department that meet that yardstick.

Section 2 states:

No provision of existing law shall be deemed to authorize—

(1) the sale, lease, donation, or other disposition, of any naval war facility to any person, or to any political entity or governmental instrumentality, foreign or domestic; or

(2) the consent to a sale, lease, donation, or other disposition of any plant with respect to which consent of the Department of the Navy is required before a sale, lease, donation, or other disposition thereof can be made; or

(3) a determination that any naval war facility is surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the Department of the Navy, or the transfer of any naval war facility from the jurisdiction or control of the Department of the Navy;

except subject to the restrictions prescribed in this Act.

The Defense Plant Corporation at the request of the Navy Department has advanced money in a great many instances to build facilities for the Navy. If that facility for which the Defense Plant Corporation has advanced the money for the Navy meets the definition of a plant, then it is within the jurisdiction of the Navy Department and the Navy Department reaches the conclusion as to whether or not it is surplus.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to the gentleman for the discussion. When I asked the question, I was thoroughly aware of the meaning of the word "plant." My question is with respect to one of these plants or all of these plants which are named on pages 9 and 10 of the report which have been established by the Defense Plant Corporation or have been constructed by them, and which have been manufacturing guns and munitions for the Navy, after they have ceased manufacturing those guns and munitions for the Navy and after the Navy has stopped calling on them to manufacture, will the Navy have the right to prevent under the terms of this act the disposal of those plants under the Surplus Property Act?

Mr. VINSON. It would then become naturally a surplus, and the Navy Department having jurisdiction of it and the money having been furnished by the Defense Corporation with the credit of the Navy, it is Navy property and the Navy has complete control of it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has been perfectly frank. That is why I am against the bill. There is no reason for it. It delays the disposal of the plants and delays the program of reconversion.

Mr. VINSON. May I say, Mr. Chairman, there is a certain thing known as the cooling off period. It is a pretty good thing sometimes to cool off, especially when you are handling somebody else's money. A 60-day delay oftentimes will work to the advantage of the Government and the taxpayers. But I cannot see how under any circumstances a 60-day delay can interfere to any great extent with the reconversion program with which we are all deeply concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, before these plants costing \$1,000,000 or more can be disposed of the Surplus Property Board would have to wait for a report from the Attorney General, who has 90 days to give an opinion as to anti-trust or monopoly—

Mr. VINSON. The only thing would be to delay the further disposition of these plants. May I say I am sorry my legal staff finds itself in complete disagreement with the legal staff of the Surplus Property Board and the conclusions of the gentleman from Mississippi. Under our interpretation of section 19 (c) of the Surplus Property Act, they have absolute authority to dispose of property under \$5,000,000 and do not have to have an affirmative act on the part of Congress. All that they need is a report to Congress on the disposition of that property and an opinion from the Attorney General to the effect that it does not create a monopoly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Except as provided in section 5, no naval war facility described in section 1 (a) (1) shall be sold, leased, donated, or otherwise disposed of, to any person, or to any political entity or governmental instrumentality, foreign or domestic, or be transferred from the jurisdiction or control of the Department of the Navy, or be determined to be surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the Department of the Navy.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW: On page 4, line 16, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That the terms of this section shall not apply to any nation which is a member of the Pan American Union."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be that any of these facilities referred to as surplus in this bill, such as ships and drydocks and other property of that nature, could be transferred and the title passed out of the Government to any of the nations of the Pan American Union; is that correct?

Mr. HINSHAW. No. I merely provide that the existing law shall remain in effect as far as might concern members of the Pan American Union. I understand this section applies only to vessels of war, as set forth in section 1 (a) (1) of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. What present law has the gentleman in mind? I know of no law except the Lend-Lease Act which permits the transfer. There is a provision in the Lend-Lease Act which keeps title in the Government until the Surplus Property Act wipes it out.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have in mind leaving the Surplus Property Act in effect as far as these countries are concerned. I think that is the effect of my amendment. At least, that is the intention. While I do not intend to press the amendment too much, I hope the gentleman will recognize the high desirability of not so regulating the Navy Department in the operation of section 3 that it cannot deal with our pan-American neighbors in the interest of the defense of this hemisphere. I know he does not have that intention in mind.

Mr. VINSON. Not a bit. Of course, we want to do everything to maintain the good neighbor policy and encourage the closest harmony and cooperation with the Pan American Union, but at the same time I am afraid the gentleman, by his amendment, is embarking in a field that requires most careful consideration, because the same thought might run with reference to our allies and then you broaden the whole field.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will excuse me for interrupting at that point, of course the allies can consider anything they want to. I believe I understand what the gentleman has in mind in this section. Nevertheless I am sure that under the act of Chapultepec and any regional provisions that may be set up in San Francisco, the United States will be well entitled to deal liberally with its regional friends in this hemisphere. I have no particular objection to withdrawing the amendment if the gentleman will assure me and assure the House that it is not the intention of the committee in any wise whatsoever to foreclose such action on the part of the Government.

Mr. VINSON. All I can assure the gentleman is exactly what the language in the bill provides. I cannot assure him that the objective he has in mind meets the language of the bill. But I can assure him of this: There is a great deal of merit in what the gentleman says, but this is such debatable ground and it is ground which has to be carefully thought out, and concerning which the State Department is interested, that I hesitate to accept the gentleman's amendment, because it is a matter that must be handled with care and caution on account of the implications it has in other directions.

Mr. HINSHAW. I want to know from the gentleman this point: Does the gentleman or his committee have any desire whatsoever to foreclose the Government from any such arrangements that might be deemed advisable for the defense of this hemisphere?

Mr. VINSON. I want to say that the Naval Affairs Committee is deeply concerned with the good-neighbor spirit that exists between the countries of this hemisphere and this Government and that we will continue to do everything in our power to aid and assist in maintaining that cordial relationship.

Mr. HINSHAW. In addition to that, the gentleman is interested in hemispheric defense? He did not mention that.

Mr. VINSON. We are very much interested in it for the very reason that the acquisition of the islands we are fighting for at San Francisco has a bearing on hemispheric defense as well as the defense of the mainland.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire or intention to muddy the waters in connection with this bill. If I had any certainty in my mind that this amendment would be agreed to by the committee, I would let it stand. But I know the gentleman may have some powerful arguments against it, and I shall not press the amendment.

Mr. VINSON. I trust the gentleman will withdraw his amendment at this time. I know what is running through his mind. All this matter is of such character that we must be patient. Let us just be patient and see what can be accomplished.

Mr. HINSHAW. Under the assurance given me by the gentleman which, while not firm, is along the lines I have in mind, I will ask unanimous consent now to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot, of course, be firm about it and I trust that the fluid position I take will be understood.

Mr. HINSHAW. I want it understood that I am in favor of that kind of arrangement under proper circumstances and not in favor of restricting the Government in such action.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. Except as provided in section 5, no naval war facility described in section 1 (a) (2), (3), or (4) shall be sold, leased, donated, or otherwise disposed of to any person or to any political entity or governmental instrumentality, foreign or domestic, or be transferred from the jurisdiction or control of the Department of the Navy, or be determined to be surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the Department of the Navy, and no consent to a sale, lease, donation, or other disposition of any plant described in section 2 (2) shall be given by the Department of the Navy, in either case unless—

(a) the Secretary of the Navy has made a report to the Congress (while both Houses are in session) setting forth the reasons why such facility or plant, as the case may be, is no longer needed by the Department of the Navy, together with the contrary views, if any, of the Chief of Naval Operations;

(b) sixty days have elapsed since the making of such report (not counting as part of such 60 days any period between the end of one session of Congress and the beginning of the next, or any period during which both Houses of Congress are in recess under the terms of a concurrent resolution); and

(c) during such 60 days the Senate and House of Representatives have failed to pass a concurrent resolution stating in substance that such facility or plant, as the case may be, should be retained by or for the use of the Department of the Navy:

Provided, That property disposals, considered to require expeditious action by the Secretary of the Navy, may be made by the Department of the Navy immediately after the Senate and House of Representatives have passed a concurrent resolution approving the property disposal or disposals proposed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out section 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 4, line 17, strike out all of section 4.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this section provides that the Navy Department, after it has declared plants and the other facilities to be surplus, shall report to Congress, and if no action is taken by the Congress within 60 days, the plant may be surplus. The language is indefinite about what disposition should be made of the property if it is declared surplus and the effect of the provision for disposal of plants in which the Government has invested billions of dollars would be further to delay and prevent reconversion to peace.

With all deference to my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he has repeatedly insisted that in connection with plants that cost \$5,000,000 or more the Congress will have no opportunity to take action. The Congress will have the same opportunity to take action that the Congress would under the pending bill and the pending bill would increase the period of 30 days, following the period of 3 months, following the period of 90 days, in which the Attorney General submits an opinion with respect to the antitrust laws.

Mr. Chairman, there must not be any misunderstanding. This matter involves the reconversion of our country from war to peace.

I call your attention to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 with respect to the disposal of plants, and I earnestly invite your attention while I read it, because the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has insisted on a construction that I assert is totally at variance with the language, which I quote:

Sec. 19. The Board, in cooperation with the various disposal agencies, shall prepare and submit to the Congress within 3 months after the enactment of this act, a report as to each of the following classes of surplus property (not including any plant which cost the Government less than \$5,000,000):

(1) Aluminum plants, (2) magnesium plants, (3) synthetic rubber plants, (4) chemical plants, (5) aviation gasoline, (6) iron and steel plants, (7) pipe line plants and facilities, (8) patents and processes and techniques, etc.

And that report shall prescribe the amount, the cost, and the location of the property, outlining the economic problems that may be created by the disposition of the property, setting forth a plan or program for the care and handling, disposition and use of the property consistent with the policies and objectives set for the Surplus Property Act.

Subsection (b) provides if they cannot submit that report they will submit an interim report. I quote:

Subsection (c). Whenever the Board may deem it to be in the interest of the objectives of this act, it may authorize the disposition of any surplus property listed in classes 9 to 12, inclusive, of subsection (a) of this act.

That has to do with aircraft, transportation facilities, and radio equipment.

I continue to read from subsection (c):

With respect to the property listed in classes 1 to 8, inclusive, no disposition shall be made or authorized until 30 days after such report or additional report has been made while Congress is in session, except that the Board may authorize any disposal agency to lease any such property for a term of not more than 5 years.

That gives the Congress the last say when it comes to aluminum plants.

We might as well be frank. There have been some of the large corporations that have been operating these plants. They had options on them and they have let their options expire. They stated they were not satisfied with the provisions of this plan, under the Surplus Property Act.

Under the terms of section 4 all the Secretary of the Navy has to do is to report it surplus, nothing said about what it cost the Government, and the bill and section is uncertain as to who disposes of it.

Now, mark my language further: With respect to any property of any kind costing \$1,000,000 or more, whether it is an aluminum plant or any other type of property, whenever any disposal agency shall begin negotiations for the disposition to private interests of the plant or plants or other property which cost the Government \$1,000,000 or more, or of any patents, processes, techniques, and inventions, irrespective of cost, the disposal agency shall notify the Attorney General, and the Attorney General shall have 90 days in which to give an opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The effect of section 4 is to increase the period of 30 days after 3 months have been given to the Surplus Property Board to make a report. The further effect would be to increase the time that has been allowed the Attorney General to submit an opinion, with the net result that this section here, without the provision for a report on the economic conditions, upon the plan for the disposal of all Government plants, upon the report as to the cost, would cause confusion worse confounded.

In a word, as the distinguished Chairman of the Surplus Property Board, Senator Gillette, said, in a letter that I will insert in the RECORD—because I think that the Congress of the United States is entitled to the views of that agency—this provision would cripple, would delay, and the terms of this provision, particularly the proviso at the conclusion of this act, would absolutely cripple the

Surplus Property Board in the disposal of plants and in the reconversion from a war to a peace basis upon the conclusion of the war and after these plants had been declared to be surplus.

For that reason, in order to protect the provisions that we have already made and the criticism that we have heard of those provisions that it requires too much time now to make the report, that it requires too much time to make the investigation and to give Congress 30 days after that in which to approve or disapprove, I respectfully submit that section 4 should be stricken, for if it continues in this bill it will further hinder and restrict and paralyze the Surplus Property Board in the disposal of plants.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Members of the Committee, this is the very heart of the bill. The whole theory of the bill is that after the owning agency, the Navy Department, makes the declaration that certain articles are to be sold, it notifies the Congress. That is what section 4 provides for in order that you, whose constituents' money has been invested in these facilities, may have an opportunity of reviewing the declaration of the Navy. If the Congress does not want to do that, why, it would be far better to strike out the enacting clause and kill the bill, because that is what would happen. The Congress, in section 4, has an opportunity of reviewing the conclusions and findings of the Navy Department.

My learned friend from Mississippi says that Congress should not have that right. The Committee on Naval Affairs maintains that as representatives of the people whose money is invested we should have that information and let the Congress pass on it.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. The thing I am confused about is just what information will the Congress have before it when this report comes back other than the fact that the Navy Department has made recommendations to dispose of certain property. What chance will we have to know what is in it? What will the report contain?

Mr. VINSON. You will have this information. The Navy Department will conclude that certain drydocks, certain naval stations, certain auxiliary vessels, or certain mine vessels are surplus to the Navy's need. They will furnish to the Speaker of the House sufficient information so that Congress can intelligently reach a decision either for or against the conclusion of the Navy Department. That is what the gentleman as a representative of his people, whose money is invested in these facilities, should have a voice in.

Mr. RIZLEY. I doubt whether I as one Representative or any other Representative, unless he had an opportunity to make some inspection himself, would know much more about whether it should be declared surplus after he got this report than he would have known in the first instance.

Mr. VINSON. How did Congress know in the first instance whether to provide the money? The committee has a hearing on it and gets the facts, and then the committee submits the information to the Congress. From that information the Members reach their determination.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman mean it will come in as a bill would come before the Congress, that when this report comes back the Committee on Naval Affairs will bring it up here, and we will discuss it on the floor of the House?

Mr. VINSON. No doubt it would include a hundred or 200 items that the Navy Department has declared surplus, which would be submitted in a memorandum to the Speaker of the House. The Speaker would refer it to the Committee on Naval Affairs. That committee would have hearings and report to the House for your decision on the matter. That is exactly the way it would come in.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When the Committee on Naval Affairs gets this information it will act on it immediately so that all the surplus property owned by the Government can be disposed of at the earliest moment?

Mr. VINSON. Exactly. The Committee on Naval Affairs will hold hearings and determine whether or not it concurs in the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy. If it does concur in that recommendation, that is the end of it. If it disagrees, the committee brings the matter before the House.

Mr. RICH. In connection with Army surplus materials the matter has to be submitted to about a dozen different organizations, and what happens is that they are not selling anything. Today, when we would have an opportunity to dispose of much of the surplus property and get a good price for it, it is lying dormant. Mr. Gillette, who has charge of the disposal of this property, is about sick and tired of his job. Unless they do something about it they will not dispose of that property and get the money, and the people will not get the merchandise that is lying in storage today and that ought to be sold. I think we are lax in not moving that material.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BELL. One thing was not clear in my mind from the discussion a little while ago. I should like to know what becomes of this property. What is its status after the Navy has handed in its report seeking to declare it surplus, and Congress has acted on that report and said that it is surplus property? Then what becomes of it?

Mr. VINSON. Then the Surplus Property Board steps in under the bill prepared by the gentleman from Mississippi and his committee. We have nothing in the world to do with the sale or disposition of it.

Mr. BELL. They can sell it, give it away, or do whatever they want to do with it?

Mr. VINSON. They dispose of it. We will have washed our hands of it. It is the Board's responsibility. All I am asking is that, after the Navy Department declares it to be surplus, Congress have the information in an orderly manner and have an opportunity to disagree or hesitate to act. Whatever happens with it after Congress acts on it is a matter that is up to the Surplus Property Board.

Mr. BELL. As I understand, the only thing this bill does in addition to what the law already provides is give Congress the right to pass upon whether the Navy uses good judgment in declaring something to be surplus. That is the only change, really.

Mr. VINSON. That is the whole thing in one syllable.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In response to the question of the gentleman from Missouri, will the distinguished chairman of the committee point out the language in this bill that states that this property will be disposed of by the Surplus Property Board, or under the Surplus Property Act?

Mr. VINSON. The Surplus Property Act governs the disposal of all surplus property. When the property becomes surplus, when Congress has not affirmatively by concurrent resolution kept it from being declared surplus property, then the Surplus Property Act takes jurisdiction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That would be true except that the bill provides that it shall not be disposed of "except as provided by this act," and I respectfully submit that the gentleman's question is in order, that one of the objections to this bill is that it is not clear as to who is going to handle that property.

Mr. VINSON. When it is declared to be surplus it will be handled under the Surplus Property Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTINGTON) there were—ayes 13, noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 5, line 23, strike out the words "by the Department of the Navy."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have just this to say: The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs a few moments ago said that while there was no language in this bill as to who or what agency would dispose of the property it would be handled by the Surplus Property Board. I in-

vite the attention of the committee to the language beginning on line 21, page 5:

Provided, That property disposals considered to require expeditious action by the Secretary of the Navy may be made by the Department of the Navy.

That is the only provision as to the disposal of property in section 4. My motion is to strike that out so there cannot be any question in the world but what disposition will be made by the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. DREWRY. The paragraph reads as follows:

Provided that, property disposals considered to require expeditious action by the Secretary of the Navy may be made by the Department of the Navy immediately after the Senate and House of Representatives have passed a concurrent resolution approving the property disposal or disposals proposed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am not striking out anything except the words "by the Department of the Navy." My amendment leaves the remainder of the language in the paragraph so that this section may contain that which the Chairman has said, to wit, provide that the Surplus Property Administration disposes of the property after Congress approves of it, as provided by the disposal agencies of that act.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Then it makes it positive that the Department of the Navy is not the disposal agency?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say so far as this proviso is concerned it makes it positive the Navy Department is not the disposal agency.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the Navy Department does not want to be the disposal agency and is not the disposal agency. The Surplus Property Board is the disposal agency and even with this language as it is, there is no doubt that the disposal agency, when a surplus has been declared and when Congress has had an opportunity to review it, has jurisdiction to dispose of the property.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, I have answered the gentleman's question. My amendment is to strike out the words "by the Department of the Navy" because the gentleman has repeatedly said it would be disposed of by the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. VINSON. I have no objection to striking out the words "by the Department of the Navy" on line 23.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That was the motion I made awhile ago.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a separate and very special provision of this bill. The bill provides in general that no property shall be disposed of without giving Congress an opportunity to have 60 days in which to review the matter and then to object affirmatively if it does not agree with the Navy's proposal to dispose of

that property. That is the rule. The provision under consideration is an exception to the rule. This takes care of the case where the Navy Department itself, and not the Surplus Property Disposal Board, deems it in the interest of the Navy and the service immediately to dispose of some naval property. In that event, Congress by affirmative action may give the Department authority to dispose of it without waiting 60 days.

I do not conceive this to be a part of the regular procedure under the Property Disposal Act.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's statement is absolutely correct. This is an exception to the general rule. It was put in in view of one of the objections raised by Admiral Edwards, with reference to the delay that might occur under certain circumstances. This is the amendment that was offered by our distinguished Member from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. I think the objective of the amendment is good, and it ought to stay in, but it would not hurt the bill if the Navy Department is left out.

Mr. MOTT. Nevertheless, I oppose the amendment to strike out this provision, and I desire to vote against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. As far as I am concerned, it is all right, but that is up to the Committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Certainly, but you admit that is the meaning of the section, all the way through, and if you agree as to the meaning why not say so, and agree to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOTT) there were—ayes 21, noes 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) No provision of this act shall prevent—

(1) the disposition under any other law of any vessel stricken from the Navy register pursuant to section 2 of the act of August 5, 1882, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, and for other purposes", or

(2) the disposition of any vessel under the act of April 29, 1943, entitled "An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto," as amended; or

(3) the lease, under any other law, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, of any naval war facility, for any period not extending beyond the date proclaimed by the President as the date of the termination of the present war, or beyond the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever first occurs; or

(4) any naval war facility from being made subject to any command or use determined to be appropriate in connection with the prosecution of the present war; or

(5) the transfer of the Coast Guard, together with its functions, property, and personnel, to the jurisdiction of another agency of the Government, or, in the case of any naval war facility acquired from any other agency of the Government under an arrangement providing for its return, the return of such facility to such Government agency pursuant to such arrangement; or

(6) the disposition of any naval war facility to any person pursuant to the exercise by such person of an option granted by the United States prior to the date of the enactment of this act, or thereafter if granted in connection with the original procurement of such naval war facility; or

(7) the scrapping or destruction of any vessel damaged beyond economical repair; or

(8) the termination by the Department of the Navy of any lease or charter party.

(b) Any plant under the control of the Department of the Navy may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, be leased for periods not exceeding 5 years each: *Provided*, That—

(1) the Secretary of the Navy has made a report to the Congress (while both Houses are in session) of the intention of the Navy Department to lease such plant;

(2) sixty days have elapsed since the making of such report (not counting as part of such 60 days any period between the end of one session of Congress and the beginning of the next, or any period during which both Houses of Congress are in recess under the terms of a concurrent resolution); and

(3) during such 60 days the Senate and House of Representatives have failed to pass a concurrent resolution stating in substance that such plant should not be leased.

(c) No disposition of property shall be deemed to be contrary to the provisions of this act, insofar as the right, title, and interest of any person in and to such property is concerned.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to inquire of the chairman of the committee the meaning or purpose of subsection (c) on page 8.

Mr. VINSON. That means that the failure of Congress to take affirmative action will not impair the title to the property. In other words, the Navy Department declares certain property surplus and it is submitted to the Congress and the Congress makes no decision either affirmative or negative about it; the failure of the Congress to take an affirmative or negative position does not impair the title. In other words, it has the effect of quieting the ownership.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, as I read this language, it states that no disposition of property, presumably under the provisions of this act, shall be deemed to be contrary to the provisions of this act, insofar as the right, title, or interest of any person in and to such property is concerned. In other words, it strikes me that under the language I have just read, notwithstanding that the provisions under which these actions shall be taken have been most carefully and meticulously set forth, that nevertheless, should the Navy Department act in contravention thereof that title would still be good in the purchaser. In other words, every safeguard and precaution is thrown around this bill down to the very last provision and then in effect you say that whether you do those things or not, no matter what you do, if you go ahead and sell the property the title is good anyway.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the language of the report. I myself was somewhat apprehensive that such an interpretation might be made by some of the Members. Let me read what the report has to say on section 5:

Section 5, to avoid any question as to title of a war facility or other property, which might arise because of provisions of the bill, also provides that insofar as the right, title, and interest of the purchaser or any other person in and to any such war facility or other property is concerned, the disposition shall not be deemed contrary to the act.

In other words you must have a provision of this kind in the bill to assure a purchaser that his title is good.

Mr. CRAVENS. Then if I purchase under the provisions of this act even in disregard of some of the previous provisions, it is that notwithstanding that my title will be good. In other words, by that last paragraph the whole bill has been circumvented simply by refusal to comply with its terms.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There can be no reasonable contravention of the gentleman's statement. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that whenever it is desired in an act to perfect and protect the title of a purchaser the act provides that the bill of sale, or deed, or other instrument that purports to transfer title under the act shall be a protection to the purchaser. But as the gentleman indicates and as he has said—and it is a fair sample of a number of provisions in this bill—subsection (c) states that no disposition, not limited to this bill, shall be deemed contrary to the provisions of this act insofar as the right, title, and interest of any person in and to such property is concerned. In other words, it makes no difference whether this law or the surplus property law has been complied with, it does not undertake to say that it should be complied with—there will not be any question but what the purchaser has title.

Mr. CRAVENS. It states here that certain provisions have to be complied with, but in the last four lines of the bill they say that even if you do not do any of those things, that does not make any difference anyway, I still get title to the property. It strikes me as ridiculous.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Let me call the gentleman's attention to section 25 of the Surplus Property Act, dealing with the matter of title, and I quote:

A deed, bill of sale, lease, or other instrument executed by or on behalf of any Government agency purporting to transfer title or any other interest in property under this act shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with the provisions of this act insofar as title or other interest of any bona fide purchasers for value, or lessees, as the case may be, is concerned.

All of those qualifying provisions are absolutely cast away by this last section (c).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely essential that this section be in the bill to insure title to any person who buys property under the terms and conditions set out in the disposal of certain surplus property.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Under the Surplus Property Act, various cities, municipalities, counties, and States may have had options on docks, plants, aircraft fields and so forth. Where the governmental agencies do not exercise their option, would not the effect of this provision in the bill and the bill itself wipe out those other options?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with profound regret that I notice the distinguished chairman and the able members of the Committee on Expenditures in Government departments are all hostile to the terms and conditions of this bill. I was hoping that the bill, having been so carefully thought out, would pass unanimously and there would be no conclusion on the part of any Members who did a magnificent legislative and constructive work in handling the Surplus Property Act, or that they would feel that act was so perfect no other committee should have the temerity to offer suggestions or any amendment in reference to a different approach to surplus property disposition. So I say, I am sorry that all of the opposition that has developed to this well thought out bill, which preserves the prerogative of the Congress, emanates from this committee that handled the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the advocacy of this measure is largely confined to members of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. VINSON. The advocacy of this measure is not only confined to the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, but it also lies in the Committee on Military Affairs and lies in the hearts and consciences of every Member of Congress who does not want to surrender his constitutional authority to the executive branch of the Government.

It has no relation whatever with the disposition of property and there lies the weakness and the trouble that the gentleman and his committee members fall into. We are not trespassing on the Surplus Property Act, we are not dealing with how you dispose of property; we are merely saying that the people's representatives shall have a voice in determining what the Navy declares to be surplus. We left to the magnificent law you prepared complete disposition of it. Cities, municipalities, and other Government agencies that get this property after Congress has refused to have anything to do with it may get it under the terms of the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Referring to page 7, subsection (8) (b), there is certain authority given to the Secretary to lease for a period of 5 years.

Mr. VINSON. That is a very important thing because we are concerned about great institutions in which the Government has invested large sums of money. The Navy Department might conclude that today is not the proper time to determine whether or not this facility or that facility is surplus because a peacetime navy has not been determined, or because world conditions are so unstable; therefore they might say that it would be the wise thing within a period of time to lease that property. Then let the Navy Department determine whether or not later on it will declare it property surplus. In other words, it merely postpones a final decision when an immediate decision might be to the disadvantage of the Government and to the Navy Department.

Mr. RICH. Suppose the Navy has a large building located in some city and somebody comes in and says: "Here is a great building, I would like to lease that building, I want to start up a business of my own"; or suppose the Navy wanted to start some kind of business in there and wanted to get somebody to do it.

Mr. VINSON. It could not do that.

Mr. RICH. Would it be legal to do that?

Mr. VINSON. There is no possibility of that. This is a wise provision and was suggested by the Navy Department. It is a wise thing to have this flexibility so that the Navy might have the opportunity to lease instead of being forced to make a decision immediately as to whether the property is surplus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOTT. Was not an amendment offered to strike out section 5?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman that there is no amendment pending other than the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this bill and I think they are possibly trying to do the right thing. Yet there is an opportunity here in the leasing of these properties whereby the Secretary of the Navy, if he chooses, may say to some of his friends that he wanted to lease some of these buildings to, "We are not going to sell them now. We will lease them," and then they may say, "If we cannot make our business go in 4 or 5 years from now, we will be in a position to know whether we want to buy these buildings." In that way they would put off the date that they would be sold. That is one side of it.

On the other hand, there is a good point in knowing whether we ought to defer the complete sale of them at that time. If I knew the psychological attitude of the Secretary of the Navy toward private business in competition with Federal Government business, then I would say, "All right; let us do it." But if the Secretary of the Navy is one of these fellows that wants to put the Government in all kinds of business, then I would not trust him as far as you could throw a bull by the tail because I am against the Government going into business in every sense possible. I want private enterprise to operate the business of this country. That is the thing that made this country great. We do not want any communism or any other kind of "ism" except Americanism.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I can assure the gentleman and also the country that we are fortunate in having a Secretary of the Navy who believes 100 percent that the Government should be out of business as much as possible, and one who believes in free enterprise. His background, might I say, was that of a distinguished Wall Street private banker, and you know that is enough to mean that he does not believe in Government regulation or Government operation.

Mr. RICH. You know I have always been against Wall Street and the Wall Street bankers. I am for the small business man in this country and I want to see him succeed. If the gentleman gives me the guaranty that the Secretary of the Navy is that kind of a man, all right.

Mr. VINSON. He is that kind of a man, and the Committee on Naval Affairs is that kind, too.

Mr. RICH. May I say that it is a great satisfaction to know that we are getting away from the communistic tendencies that have been trying to engulf this Nation of ours. I have been so scared for the last few years seeing where we were heading, but I have learned to know President Truman, and I think he is going to try to put communism on the shelf. I do not believe President Truman is going to permit anyone to make this Nation communistic, and I am going to back him up on that. I hope that we will still continue to have free private enterprise in America. Let us keep America American, and let us keep America for the people of this country, and as for those fellows who want to make this a communistic Nation, let us start them down the chute and keep them going.

Mr. VINSON. And at the same time let Congress have a voice in helping run the Government.

Mr. RICH. That is right. We have turned many things over to these bureaucrats down here, and the quicker you get in now and clean up these bureaucrats, the better we will be off. President Truman is on the right road, and after he accomplishes that, America will survive for another 169 years and we will celebrate for years to come. Let it be said of us that we were the ones who continued to make this Nation one which our

forefathers intended it to be. So let us all put our shoulders to the wheel and keep America American.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 7, lines 21 and 22, strike out "under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee a few moments ago stated that there is no provision in this bill to interfere with the power and authority we have given to the Surplus Property Board. As the committee has been advised, if the Surplus Property Board does not dispose of any plant though disposal agencies it may provide for the lease of that plant under regulations it may prescribe by the disposal agency. This bill provides:

Any plant under the control of the Department of the Navy may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, be leased for periods not exceeding 5 years each.

The Surplus Property Act provides that all plants shall be leased under regulations as prescribed by that act. The gentleman has repeatedly stated that he does not intend to repeal or modify any power of the Board as to the disposal of property.

Mr. VINSON. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that he is falling into error. This is not surplus and we are not talking about surplus property here.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I said that any plant leased under the Surplus Property Act would be leased subject to regulations of that act. This language provides that any plant under the control of the Department of the Navy may be leased for periods not exceeding 5 years each.

Mr. MANASCO. If the gentleman will yield, referring to the statement the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs made a while ago, that the only opposition on this floor seemed to come through jealousy on the part of the Committee on Expenditures—

Mr. VINSON. I did not use the word "jealousy." I would not do that.

Mr. MANASCO. You can draw that conclusion—I want to say for the Record and for the benefit of the House that our committee has absolutely no jealousy of any committee of the House. I have supported almost every bill the chairman of this committee has ever brought in.

Mr. VINSON. May I suggest to the chairman, then, let us not surrender our authority over certain properties to the executive branch. Let us dispose of it here on the floor of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have no disposition to say anything further except that the surplus property bill provides that any plant may be leased for not exceeding 5 years under regulations provided by the act, and this changes that act. It is up to the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down for the reason that the property under discussion has not yet reached the stage of being surplus property. The Navy De-

partment has not classified it as surplus. It is being retained in the Navy Department, and the Navy Department prefers to lease it instead of classifying it as surplus. Therefore, I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTINGTON) there were—ayes 10, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 8, strike out subsection (c).

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the subsection that was condemned by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]. I concur in his conclusion that the provision has no place in this bill, for the reasons stated by him, and ask that it be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTINGTON) there were—ayes 11, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Strike out subsection (7) on page 7, line 16.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, neither this bill nor the Surplus Property Act undertakes to dispose of combat vessels such as battleships. This section reads, "the scrapping or destruction of any vessel damaged beyond economical repair." It would leave it to the Department of the Navy to decide whether they would scrap or destroy a battleship or cruiser beyond such repair. It is the theory of the Surplus Property Act that no disposition should be made of these combat vessels except by act of the Congress. For that reason I have offered this amendment to strike subsection 7 of section 5 (a) from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON of Mississippi: Add a new section:

"Sec. 6. Any disposal or lease of property other than property described in section 1 (a) (1) which is subject to this act and shall become authorized under this act, shall be made in accordance with the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and all lawful regulations issued thereunder."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, as has been developed in the course of this debate, at least in the minds of some, there has been from time to time the view that this bill did not authorize the disposal of property as provided by the Surplus Property Act. There is no language

definitely to that effect, but the chairman of the committee has repeatedly stated that the disposals authorized under this act were to be made as provided by the Surplus Property Act. I offer this amendment as an independent section to leave no room for doubt after these reports have been submitted to the Congress and after the Department has declared the property to be surplus, that the disposal or lease of the property shall be made as provided by the Surplus Property Act, as I have understood the chairman has repeatedly admitted. If there is any provision which is germane to the provisions of this act, it would be a provision as to the meaning of the word "dispose," which is used repeatedly in this act.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The legislation now before the Committee for its consideration involves the question of disposition of certain property. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is a limitation and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Surplus Property Board has repeatedly stated in his letter, the provisions of the pending bill are not clear. It will hinder and delay the disposition of this property. The purpose of the amendment is to clarify and make certain that any disposal of property under the terms of this act, which we have been repeatedly advised should be made by the Surplus Property Board and under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act, should so be made. In my judgment, the amendment certainly should be adopted in the interest of clarity, and to avoid confusion.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself very much in the attitude of a great many Members about this proposed legislation. I mean by that I have serious doubts about it.

I want to say in the beginning that I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and for his committee, the Committee on Naval Affairs. They have done great work in channeling through this Congress all essential legislation to win the war. But we are confronted now, it seems to me, with a very fundamental proposition and that is whether we are going to take out of the provisions of the surplus property legislation which we passed that portion of that property which comes under the jurisdiction of the Navy. If that happens, then is it not also reasonable to expect the Military Affairs Committee will come in with a bill to take from it the property over which the War Department has control?

Further, to show my complexity and my misgivings about the matter, I want to say that when this legislation originally started in this body, this body, as the result of the efforts of your Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning and your Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] is chairman, and my colleague, the gentleman from Mis-

issippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is a member, did a splendid job on that. But when it went to the other body they completely upset the apple cart, and the conferees yielded to the Senate conferees. The result was that we got legislation which frankly I do not think the administration can operate under. I felt so keenly about that bill when it came back here in the conference report, although it bore my name and had been sponsored by my committee, that I voted against the conference report and made a brief statement that day to the effect that the bill could not function.

Recently your Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning had the members of the Surplus Property Board, which was set up as a result of the action of the other body and which was contrary to the concepts of this body, to come down before our committee, after having talked with them privately on several occasions, to try to find out the difficulties they were up against, because I say to you very frankly, the administration of this surplus property is in a chaotic condition. It is not the fault of the gentlemen appointed to that board. There is going to continue to be chaos until the set-up is changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Unfortunately we could not get any particular or specific recommendations from the gentlemen constituting that board, and we have not gotten them yet, although they realize that because of the conflicting priorities set up in the act and the general difficulties of administration that they cannot function under it. So our Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning is now awaiting the report from that Board on recommendations for which we have asked them that will result in an effort on our part at least to bring some order out of chaos by offering the proper amendment to this legislation so that that Board or whatever other set-up is made can function and these billions of dollars of surplus property be disposed of in an orderly, uniform, and fair manner to all departments of the Government and the taxpayers and everybody else.

I do not like the existing legislation, but I am apprehensive that this legislation which is now being proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia and sponsored by his very able committee will not add anything constructive to the present situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. What I should like to see is this matter left in status quo, which

is a pretty bad status at that, I confess, until we can work out something; until we can get these recommendations from this committee based upon the experience that they have had in the practical administration of it. I may be in error about this, permit me to say to my distinguished colleagues, for I have not had the time to go into this proposed legislation as fully as I should like; but when you start taking the Navy out of the operation of this legislation you set a precedent and will have other departments seeking similar action. So you have just added further chaos to the whole thing.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. What the gentleman says about the disagreements and differences between the House and the Senate on the Property Disposal Act is interesting, but I am sure the gentleman will recall that the House unanimously adopted an amendment which would give the Congress authority to have the last word on the disposition of major naval property and that the Senate concurred in that amendment. This is the very issue involved in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman is certainly in favor of the Congress of the United States determining the postwar military, naval, and maritime policies of the United States, is he not?

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman asks if I am in favor of that? Naturally.

Mr. IZAC. That is exactly what this bill purports to do for the Navy. I expect, as does the gentleman, that the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will also come in here with other bills similar to this, because these are the three technical services that have to do with the welfare of the United States in the family of nations, in international relationships, having to do with war and peace. I cannot imagine anything of greater import to the people of the country than to have the Congress of the United States determine those three policies, the merchant marine, the naval and military.

Mr. COLMER. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from California that we are all in accord on that objective. The point I am making is that if you are going to amend this legislation, let us not do it by piecemeal. Let us do it in an orderly fashion. At least that is my suggestion.

Mr. IZAC. We are not attempting to amend this. We are merely setting up within the Navy Department what the Navy Department may declare surplus. After the Navy Department declares it

surplus the disposal agency goes ahead and disposes of it. We are not attempting to interfere with that.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. I am going to predicate my statement on the remarks of the gentleman from California. Would not the first proposition be for the Congress to pass a military bill of some kind insuring a sufficient number of men to man these vessels before we find out how many vessels we ought to keep?

Mr. COLMER. Of course, that is the gentleman's idea.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say that I concur with the gentleman that the Surplus Property Act provides for reports and recommendations. Personally I think some amendments should be made to the act to clarify the conflicting provisions. I also concur with the gentleman's statement, too, that this would add confusion worse than confounded to what already exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman from Mississippi that none of us is satisfied with the Surplus Property Act. I have always felt that in formulating that legislation we proceeded upon the wrong premise. In other words, I felt that it should have been a demobilization bill, a law under which we would demobilize the war effort for which we are so highly mobilized. Instead of that we passed a bill affecting all of the property owned by the Government of the United States, including even the very building in which we are meeting. If any Government official would declare this building to be surplus, it could be sold by the Surplus Property Board under that act. The same is true of the White House.

This bill seeks to recapture a portion of the power which we should never have abandoned. It has always been one of the fundamental laws of the land that Government real estate should not be disposed of, I care not how small or unimportant it might be, without permission of the Congress of the United States. But when we passed this law, we permitted the executive agencies to dispose of real estate that could never have been acquired except during the war period without the specific authorization of Congress. Now, this stands on a whole lot higher plane than other items of Government property.

We are charged with a specific constitutional duty with reference to the Army and Navy. We are charged specifically with maintaining a Navy and raising and supporting an Army. It is entirely proper, therefore, that we proceed first with the Army and Navy. I am sorry that the parliamentary situation is such that this bill must relate only to the Navy. It should relate also to the Army. But surely we should discharge our full

constitutional function of maintaining a Navy and raising and supporting an Army in accordance with the constitutional obligation that is placed upon us. It is not a question of amending this law piecemeal. We are attempting to take out of the law something that should never have been placed in it. We are attempting to take out of it and bring back to Congress those constitutional functions which we should always have maintained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, think that the only thing wrong with this bill is that it does not make similar provisions for the War Department and the Maritime Commission. It has been my privilege recently to sit in on the hearings of the deficiency committee of the war agencies bill, and among the agencies coming before us was the Surplus Property Board. I confess that what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has said about the confusion or the lack of definiteness in the minds of the Surplus Property Board, is a feeling that I share with him. I do not want to say at this time just what has developed in those hearings, but I can say this as a matter of conclusion that the Surplus Property situation is far from satisfactory to the average Member of Congress, I am confident. There is nothing in this bill that is going to confuse that situation whatsoever. So far as I can see, it merely says that before the Navy can declare property surplus in these major units that Congress will have an opportunity to say whether or not it agrees, and as part of our responsibility for providing regulations for the Army and the Navy we ought to assert that right and we ought to recognize our responsibility, and we should follow this legislation with similar legislation for the War Department and the Maritime Commission.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] to section 6. I ask the Committee to vote it down, for this reason: It sets up the Surplus Property Agency as the disposing agency, and in the preceding section the bill confers upon the Secretary of the Navy the authority to negotiate leases. Leasing is a very important thing that might confront the Secretary of the Navy, so therefore if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is adopted, then all leases would have to be made under the terms and conditions of the Surplus Property Act. We may not want to make it under those terms and conditions, so therefore I think the proper thing to do is to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3180) to impose certain restrictions on the disposition of naval vessels and facilities necessary to the maintenance of the combatant strength and efficiency of the Navy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 267, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTINGTON) there were—ayes 71, noes 17.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial entitled "Angleworms and Rattlesnakes" which appeared in the Jefferson County Union of Fort Atkinson, Wis., under date of May 24, 1945.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a telegram and a newspaper clipping.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record and include a broadcast she made over the Blue Network on Tuesday, May 29, on America and communism.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution.

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record and include an article by Mrs. Roosevelt.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution adopted by the Independent Hungarian Political Club, of Gary, Ind.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article and a short poem by Mr. W. M. Pierson, of Dallas, Tex.

Mr. EUCK, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. JUDD asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include an article from the June issue of Fortune magazine.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] has been granted permission to address the House for 1 hour tomorrow. She will be unable to use that time. I ask unanimous consent that the order be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRINTING A REVISED EDITION OF THE PAMPHLET, OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT, ETC.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 650) a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 60) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a revised edition of House Document No. 619, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?" compiled by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, be printed as a public document, and that 75,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 50,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 25,000 for the use of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader has announced that next week the House will consider the Bretton Woods agreements. I rise to respectfully request that that decision be reconsidered for what seems to me to be compelling reasons.

The hearings of the testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee have not yet been completely printed, and will not be ready for several days. Accordingly, at the time this bill is scheduled to come before the House, no Member outside the Banking and Currency Committee will have had an opportunity to study the testimony which will probably run between 1,200 and 2,000 pages.

If this were routine domestic legislation, the lack of this vitally informative data by the full membership might be safely ignored. But the Bretton Woods proposals are neither routine nor domestic legislation. They are infinitely complicated international plans, which involve the future good will and economic recovery of the nations of the world.

Accordingly, I submit that the membership should have at least a week to study the hearings before they are asked to pass judgment on these proposals. Unless that is done, this Congress, in my humble judgment, will not be operating in accordance with its established legislative functions. The House will be passing, without the possibility of in-

formed discussion by the full membership, on proposals which, unless understood by each signator nation, will most certainly cause ill will and trouble between the great powers of the world.

The foregoing is a serious danger, and I offer evidence to verify it from the galley proofs of the hearings of the committee:

First. Testimony from England, from the Financial News, London, April 10, 1945:

This time the majority of American opinion favors a stabilization of all currencies in relation to gold. The Bretton Woods final act has been submitted to Congress for ratification, and its supporters claim that its adoption would mean stabilization. As in 1873, its adoption would involve no immediate change. But the chances are that, when it comes to be applied in full, Congress and American opinion will realize that in the long run it will fail to bring stabilization.

If sufficient attention had been paid in the United States to official British statements on the subject, this fact would have been duly realized over there. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had made it plain on more than one occasion that acceptance of the Bretton Woods plan would not mean legal stabilization of sterling, and that sterling would be devalued without hesitation whenever the maintenance of its stability involved deflation. He declared in his Mansion House speech in October 1944, that while His Majesty's Government would be prepared to consult the fund on the question of changing the value of sterling, it would reserve to itself the right of final decision.

Possibly these statements may be dismissed in the United States as having been meant for home consumption in order to disarm opposition to the Bretton Woods plan. But to avoid subsequent reproaches it might be well if American opinion realized that the Government or its successor is certain to be held by Parliament and British opinion to these promises. Feeling against a deflationary policy for the sake of defending sterling at its gold parity is too strong in this country for any government to disregard it. For this reason, as far as sterling is concerned, Bretton Woods cannot in the long run mean stabilization. If the United States were to accept the final act in the opposite belief, the ultimate disillusionment of American opinion might be as painful as the discovery in the seventies of the true meaning of the Coinage Act of 1873.

Second. A similar lack of understanding of the Russian position is revealed by the committee hearings. Note the following colloquy from the galley proofs:

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, can you answer a question for me? Can you tell me what Russia plans to do with their quota in the fund? I have heard some stories. I wonder if you could tell me what Russia plans to do?

The CHAIRMAN. What she plans to do with what?

Mr. BUFFETT. What Russia plans to do with their quota in the fund.

The CHAIRMAN. No; I cannot tell you what Russia intends to do with their quota.

Mr. BUFFETT. There have been some pretty positive statements about what Russia proposes to do with that, and if their statements are correct, and he [Mr. E. E. Brown] was a delegate there, it is entirely different from what the people of this country understand as a purpose of the fund and that is not a technicality.

Mr. BROWN. If you will pardon me, in that connection—

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say for Mr. Brown, I have a high regard for him. I think

he is a very able man. I do not think he knows what Russia is going to do.

Mr. BUFFETT. Don't you think we ought to know?

The CHAIRMAN. If we go into it we have very liberal provisions of withdrawal. We could withdraw at any time and we could get back every dollar we put into it except the obligations that have been made before we withdraw.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the foregoing, I urge the majority leadership to reconsider their decision. I cannot believe that those in control of this House will direct the membership to pass on this intricate international proposal without all Members having a reasonable opportunity to study and appraise the testimony. But unless that opportunity is accorded them I repeat this charge that this great legislative body, the House of Representatives of the United States, will not be conducting its affairs in accordance with its inherent parliamentary responsibilities.

The American people have expended their blood, tears, and treasure all over the globe for the cause of freedom, peace, and representative government. They are entitled to a better performance from this House than such a procedure would indicate.

I urge that the membership be permitted to have at least a full week to study the hearings after they become available. This is a reasonable, constructive suggestion, and I earnestly hope the majority leadership will act favorably upon it.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of the estate of Myles Perz;

H. R. 1947. An act to authorize an increase in the pay of the chaplain at the United States Military Academy while serving under reappointment for an additional term or terms;

H. R. 2007. An act for the relief of Hattie Bowers; and

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 383. An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; and

S. 938. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of the estate of Myles Perz;

H. R. 1947. An act to authorize an increase in the pay of the chaplain at the United States Military Academy while serving under reappointment for an additional term or terms;

H. R. 2007. An act for the relief of Hattie Bowers; and

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PACE, for 6 days, until June 7, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will hold a meeting in open session, on Friday, June 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, June 1, 1945, to resume public hearings on H. R. 3170, a bill to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports, and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments at 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, June 1, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 2117.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Friday, June 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to consider H. R. 2630.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Tuesday, June 5, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., at which time testimony will be heard on H. R. 170.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary, beginning at 10 a. m., on Monday, June 11, 1945, on the bill H. R. 2788, to amend title 28 of the Judicial Code in regard to the limitation of certain actions, and for other purposes. The hearing will be held in room 346, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the full Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, June 12, 1945, at 10 a. m., at which time hearings will be re-

sumed on H. R. 3235, a bill readjusting the rates of postage on books.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold an executive hearing at 10:30 o'clock a. m., on Thursday, June 14, 1945, on H. R. 173, H. R. 1584, and H. R. 2256.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on Friday, June 15, 1945, beginning at 10 a. m., on the bills H. R. 33 and H. R. 3338, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (referees: method of appointment, compensation, etc.). The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

The Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled hearings, to begin at 10 a. m., on Monday, June 18, 1945, on the following joint resolutions: House Joint Resolution 67, to declare the policy of the Government of the United States in regard to tide and submerged lands; and House Joint Resolution 118, House Joint Resolution 119, House Joint Resolution 122, House Joint Resolution 123, House Joint Resolution 124, House Joint Resolution 125, House Joint Resolution 128, House Joint Resolution 129, House Joint Resolution 130, House Joint Resolution 134, House Joint Resolution 137, House Joint Resolution 138, House Joint Resolution 146, House Joint Resolution 148, House Joint Resolution 153, House Joint Resolution 172, and House Joint Resolution 193, entitled "To quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States, and to prevent further clouding of such titles". The hearings will be held in the Judiciary Committee room 346, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

523. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 230. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 16, 1942, on a cooperative beach-erosion study of the Lake Erie shore line in the vicinity of Huron, Ohio, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with

illustrations, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 630). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 276. Resolution providing for the printing, as a House document, of the proceedings of the one hundred and fifty-fourth anniversary of the independence of Poland; without amendment (Rept. No. 631). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 277. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document the proceedings in commemoration of Pan American Day; without amendment (Rept. No. 632). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 3238. A bill readjusting the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising and other matter of fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 206. Joint resolution extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 60. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a public document of a revised edition of House Document No. 619, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?" and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 650). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 392. An act for the relief of Nebraska Wesleyan University and Herman Platt; without amendment (Rept. No. 633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRANAHA: Committee on Claims. H. R. 892. A bill for the relief of Madeline J. MacDonald; without amendment (Rept. No. 634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1007. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Brown Waggoner; with amendment (Rept. No. 635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1003. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriette E. Harris; with amendment (Rept. No. 636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Lester B. McAllister and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1320. A bill for the relief of M. Elizabeth Quay; without amendment (Rept. No. 638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1560. A bill for the relief of J. B. Grigsby; with amendment (Rept. No. 639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1595. A bill for the relief of the borough of Beach Haven, Ocean County, N. J.; with amendment (Rept. No. 640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1678. A bill for the relief of Batista Illinico; with amendment (Rept. No. 641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Southwestern Drug Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1891. A bill for the relief of the Grandview Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1917. A bill for the relief of John E. Jennings; with amendment (Rept. No. 644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of L. A. Williams; with amendment (Rept. No. 645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2060. A bill for the relief of D. W. Key; with amendment (Rept. No. 646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2226. A bill for the relief of Hugh P. Gunnells and Mrs. Dezaree Gunnells; with amendment (Rept. No. 647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:
H. R. 3361. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 73 of the Hawaiian organic act, as amended; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:
H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution making an appropriation for emergency flood-control work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOPE:
H. Res. 278. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the effect upon the food supply of the order of the War Production Board to permit distillers to manufacture distilled liquors for beverage purposes during the month of July 1945; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to assist families of servicemen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to exempt from taxation the income of overseas veterans to the limit of \$5,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNINGS:
H. R. 3362. A bill for the relief of O. P. Henry; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3363. A bill for the relief of Paul W. Mankin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3364. A bill for the relief of E. C. Browder and Charles Keydon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONRONEY:
H. R. 3365. A bill for the relief of Kay Beth Bednar; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEA:
H. R. 3366. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Susie Farley, Donna Louise Farley, Helen Moss, and Melvin Moss; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

816. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of William Bierman and 31 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

817. Also, petition of Paul Lungstras and 33 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

818. Also, petition of W. J. Wright and 31 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

819. Also, petition of H. M. James and 29 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

820. Also, petition of C. F. Fostner and 31 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

821. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

822. By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Petition of the Citizens Joint Committee on National Representation for the District of Columbia, and the president of the Constitution and Cooperative Organization, whose names are subscribed hereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

823. By the SPEAKER: Petition of city of Dearborn, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting the action of the Federal Public Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

824. Also, petition of the Alameda County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging that Congress expedite the payment of compensation claims by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1945

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 31, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, hushing our thoughts to stillness, we would school our spirits in sincerity and truth as we wait before Thee who knowest the secrets of our hearts.

We pause at this wayside altar, not just to bow our spirits in a passing gesture of devotion and then go on our busy

way with lives empty of Thee; rather, we come to ask Thy presence and Thy guidance as this day we face the stress of decisions, the strain of toil, the weight of burdens, and the call of duty. Despite the brutalities of man, keep love's banners floating o'er us as we march breast forward in the ranks of those who do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with their God. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 31, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 510) to amend sections 11 (c) and 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2600) to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3180) to impose certain restrictions on the disposition of naval vessels and facilities necessary to the maintenance of the combatant strength and efficiency of the Navy, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 60) authorizing the printing as a public document of a revised edition of House Document No. 619, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?" and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1804. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska," approved June 5, 1942; and

H. R. 2600. An act to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of inter-